Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

UG 21
Sh13

DEC 29 1948

UG21
Sh13

A

TREATISE ON BAPTISM,

IN

TWO PARTS.

PART I.—INFANT BAPTISM.
PART II.—THE MODE.

BY

~~REV~~. HIRAM M. SHAFFER.

"For they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them," Isa. lxv, 23.

"And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," Gal. iii, 29.

CINCINNATI:
~~PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,~~
~~AT THE~~ METHODIST BOOK CONCERN, ~~CORNER OF MAIN AND EIGHTH.~~

R. P. Thompson, Printer.

1859.

T C
Baptism
8549
LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY 2, KANSAS

Entered according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1847, by HIRAM M. SHAFFER, in the Clerk's Office for the District Court of Ohio.

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST SEMINARY

265,17
S525

CONTENTS.

PART I.

INFANT BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

Objections to the doctrine of infant baptism examined—Express command—Want of faith—What good will it do to baptize infants? . . Page 11

CHAPTER II.

First Position: God had a Church before Christ came, and in it infants were recognized as members. Second Position: The Church which was in existence before Christ came was not destroyed, but was continued down into the Gospel dispensation, and now constitutes the Christian Church. 33

CHAPTER III.

It was a Gospel Church—The name would be changed—Christ shall reign on David's throne—Christ died that the blessings of Abraham might come to the Gentiles—Parable of the vineyard—The house and partition wall—Olive tree—Christ was a minister of the Jewish Church—For this Church Christ died—The gates of the Jewish Church were to remain open to receive Gentile converts—A prophetic view of the Church in the time of its millennial glory—Similarity of expression in the Old and the New Testament—One Lord, one faith, one baptism. 42

1854?

CHAPTER IV.

Objections to the foregoing: 1. Mr. Campbell's, from Dan. ii, 44—2. I will build my Church—3. From Gal. iv, 21–31: Cast out—4. If children are Church members, and have a right to baptism, they should be admitted to the communion. . . . . Page 75

CHAPTER V.

Suffer the little children to come unto me—Proselyte baptism—Example—Children capable of entering into covenant. 85

CHAPTER VI.

The practice of the apostles in baptizing whole families—Lydia and her household—The jailer and all his—Children in a state of justification. . . . 97

CHAPTER VII.

No controversy on infant baptism in the first ages of the Church—History of infant baptism. . 105

PART II.

MODE OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

Definition of bapto and baptizo. 123

CHAPTER II.

The sense in which the Scriptures use the word baptize. 137

CHAPTER III.

John's baptism. 160

CHAPTER IV.

Christ's baptism. . . . . Page 175

CHAPTER V.

The baptism of the eunuch, by Philip, Acts viii. 184

CHAPTER VI.

The baptism of the Israelites. 191

CHAPTER VII.

On Romans vi, and Colossians ii. 198

CHAPTER VIII.

The baptism on the day of Pentecost—The baptism of Cornelius—The baptism of Paul—the baptism of the jailer. 217

CHAPTER IX.

Immersion impracticable under many circumstances—Congregation going to the water—A change of clothing—Immersion compared to a bank bill. 234

CHAPTER X.

The three that bear record in heaven, and in the earth, 1 John v, 7, 8—Westminster Assembly. 245

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/treatiseonbaptis0000hira

INTRODUCTION.

HAVING had several public discussions, at different points in northern Ohio, on the subject of baptism, with distinguished advocates of immersion, our friends have urged us to furnish the public with the arguments used on those occasions in the form of a book. We have, at last, consented to do so. The arguments we present with entire confidence, having laid them before learned and talented opposers a number of times, for their scrutiny and criticism. This work will present the arguments on infant baptism, and the mode, in a consecutive, though very brief form, so that the reader may have the whole subject before him without wading through much reading. It will, also, be useful by way of reference, as it contains the principal testimony used in the discussion of this subject. This work has been prepared amidst the many and pressing duties assigned us by the Church:

it is offered to the public with reluctance. Believing it may aid in settling the minds of some who are seeking for truth on this subject, we are induced to publish it.

HIRAM M. SHAFFER.

Wooster, O., Oct., 1846.

PART I.

INFANT BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

Objections to the Doctrine of Infant Baptism Examined—Express Command—The Want of Faith—What Good will it do to Baptize Infants?

BEFORE a superstructure is reared, it is necessary to clear away the rubbish, and lay the foundation; therefore, we will examine the objections to the doctrine of infant baptism.

The *first* which we will notice, raised by the Baptist, is the following: (By the term '*Baptist*," we mean all those sects that oppose infant baptism, and practice immersion exclusively:)

"That if the Savior and his apostles had designed to teach the doctrine of infant baptism, they would have given an *express*, or *positive* command; but as they have not *thus* expressly, or positively commanded it, we take it for granted they did not intend to teach it; therefore, infants are not proper subjects of baptism."

Let us examine this objection. "*Express*," or "*positive*," is opposed to inference, anal-

ogy, or implication. It must be stated plainly: as, they were "baptized, both men and women," at Samaria, by Philip.

This is *positive*, or *express*. We do not arrive at the conclusion that men and women were baptized on that occasion by a course of reasoning, analogy, or inference; but men and women are expressly mentioned.

If we are to be governed by this principle, it would destroy the Christian Church. That is, if we are not to believe and practice any thing, but what is expressly or positively mentioned in the New Testament, it would throw *female* communion, the *Christian* Sabbath, *family* prayer, as well as infant baptism, out of the Church.

First. In reference to female communion, we would ask the question, Where is an *express*, or *positive* precept, or command for female communion? This cannot be found in the Bible Do not understand us as opposing it, for we believe it right that women should partake of the symbols of the broken body and shed blood of the Savior. But we arrive at this conclusion by inference and analogy. Surely they can have no objection, should we,

in the same way, more clearly prove infant baptism.

It is acknowledged by every branch of the Baptist Church that women should be admitted to the Lord's table. But on what grounds? On *inferential* testimony. In this we see a great inconsistency. There are two sacraments in the Church, baptism and the eucharist—doubtless of equal solemnity and importance. They admit to the *one* women upon inferential testimony; while, at the same time, they reject infants from the other, though coming with the same kind of evidence, and call aloud for an *express*, or a *positive* command. This, we think, is an inconsistency which would be difficult to reconcile.

Being pressed with this argument, they try to find an express command for female communion. They generally bring forward Acts ii, 46: "And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." They say the personal pronoun "*they*" refers back to Acts i, 14: "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and

Mary the mother of Jesus, and with the brethren." They *infer* the phrase, "breaking of bread," means the Lord's supper, and in this way make out a positive precept for female communion! Admitting they are correct, is it not wholly *inference* after all? But there is no doubt they are incorrect in their inference that the "breaking of bread" spoken of there means the Lord's supper. After the resurrection of Christ, and before he was made known to his disciples, two of them were going to Emmaus; the Savior fell in company with them, and when they arrived at the place where they had intended to tarry for the night, they pressed him to tarry with them; he went in and sat down to "meat with them;" he took bread and blessed it, and broke, and gave it to them; and their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of sight. And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in the "breaking of bread," Luke xxiv, 30–35. Here the "breaking of bread" has reference to a common meal, or a supper, which they sat down to eat.

Mr. Boothe says, "Does not Paul, when he says, 'Let a man examine himself, and so let

him eat,' enjoin a reception of the sacred supper? Does not the man, (ανθρωπος,) Anthropos, there used, often stand as a name of our species, without regard to sex?" True. But does it always? By no means. For instance, "And Abimelech charged all his people, saying, He that toucheth this man, (ανθρωπου,) or his *wife*, shall surely be put to death," Gen. xxvi, 11; "For this cause shall a man (ανθρωπος) leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife," Matt. xix, 5; "And their faces were as the faces of men, (ανθρωπων,) and they had hair as the hair of women," Rev. ix, 7, 8. Numerous other instances might be given in which the word ανθρωπος does not stand for the species, but to distinguish the sexes. Because the word sometimes stands for our species, our opponents *infer* that it does here; therefore, they bring it forward as a *positive* command for female communion.

Mr. Campbell tries to make out a positive precept for female communion from 1 Cor. xi, 26 He says, "In the first seventeen verses the word ανηρ (aner) man occurs fourteen times, and the word γυνη (gune) *woman*, sixteen times; and in the 16th verse, the word τις (tis) is used,

referring to both genders." And then says, "As oft," says the apostle, "as ye," men and women of whom I have been speaking, "eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come."

We are not a little surprised at this. A man of Mr. Campbell's erudition to advance such a *weak* criticism as the above for a positive precept for female communion! Read the 16th verse, "But if any man (τις) seems to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Church of God." The apostle is not speaking of communion in any sense; but of men and women praying or preaching in the church *covered* or *uncovered*. Examine the forepart of the chapter. But he wishes to make the impression that the word τις, referring to both genders, is used in the 26th verse. Then says, "Show ye (men and women) the Lord's death till he come." He then raises the shout of victory, and says, "Here, then, is a positive command for *men and women to show forth the Lord's death* till he come."

The word (tis) is not used in the 26th verse. It reads as follows: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the

Lord s death till he come." From this text nothing can be gained to show that reference is had to females; and as in the 28th verse ανθρωπος (man) is used, and we have seen above that this word is sometimes used to distinguish the sexes, the inference is against rather than in favor of female communion. Hence Mr. Campbell's criticism is a total failure. And the fact that Mr. Campbell has introduced it here for a *positive* command for female communion, is convincing proof that there is no such command in the Bible.

Secondly. To require a positive command for all our faith and practice would destroy the Christian Sabbath. Where is the positive command to change the *seventh* day of the week for the *first?* It is not in the Bible. Yet our opponents believe the *first* day of the week to be the Sabbath, and practice accordingly.

We should receive *that* objection to infant baptism with a great deal of caution, which, if it were carried out in reference to the Sabbath, would destroy it. The Church cannot exist without the Sabbath.

Thirdly. It would destroy family prayer.

Where is the express command that you should pray in your family? Yet nearly every branch of the Protestant Church believes it to be a duty enjoined in holy Scriptures, and practice accordingly. Now, if infants are to be rejected from baptism for the want of an *express*, or *positive* precept, then females are to be debarred the privilege of the sacred supper! The first day of the week is not to be observed as the holy Sabbath! The family altar, also, must be demolished! Again: our Baptist brethren hold to the doctrine of *close communion:* that is, they will not permit members of other branches of the Church, however *pious*, to commune with them. They are as strenuous about this as they are in their opposition to infant baptism. But where in the Bible is the positive command for this?

They give it as a reason for their practice in this respect, that others are not baptized. They say no person is baptized except he has been immersed; and *even that* immersion is not valid except it has been performed by one who has been immersed himself: without baptism (legal immersion) you do not belong to the Church of Christ; therefore, the Baptists look

on all other professing Christians, so far as having privileges in the Church, as in a state of heathenism, and not belonging to the Church of Christ.

If this position is correct, it can be very easily shown their whole Church is an *unbaptized one*, and not *one* in their whole communion has ever been legally baptized!

The following is taken from the Memoir of Roger Williams, a disaffected Presbyterian clergyman, who established the first Baptist Church in America, published by James D. Knowles, Professor of Pastoral Duties in the Newton Theological Institution. "One of the first causes of disturbance between Mr. Williams and the infant colony was, that he wished them to make a public declaration of repentance for having communion with the Churches of England, while they lived there; and refused to join the congregation at Boston, till they should do so," p. 46. Again, pp. 105–6, "We may not unreasonably suppose, that Mr. Williams, on further study of the Scriptures, and finding that several of the colonists had embraced Baptist principles, was himself convinced that *he had not been baptized*. He accordingly resolved to

obey the Savior's command, and unite in a Church with such persons as might be willing to join him. A difficulty now presented itself. They had been educated in the Episcopal Church, and were accustomed to regard the clergy with respect, as the only legal administrators of the Christian ordinances. Mr. Williams himself strongly felt this difficulty. *He had not himself been immersed;* and it seemed a reasonable conclusion, *that he could not with propriety baptize his brethren*, till he had received baptism. The most obvious expedient in their circumstances was adopted. Mr. Ezekiel Holliman was selected to baptize Mr. Williams, who *then* baptized the administrator and ten others. This event occurred in March 1638. *Thus* was formed the first Baptist Church in America, and the second, as it is stated, in the British empire."

We find from the above, that the *first* administrator of immersion in the Baptist Church in the United States, was Ezekiel Holliman, a *lay*-member, and one who had not been immersed himself. If that baptism were good then, surely it is good now. That is, the baptism of a lay-member, and one who has not been im-

mersed. If, then, the baptism of a lay-member, who has not been immersed himself, is not legal or valid baptism, as our Baptist brethren aver, then the whole Baptist Church is without valid baptism until this day!

The only effort to evade the force of this conclusion, that we have seen, that deserves attention, is, "That Baptist ministers from Wales, and other places, that were in the regular line of immersion succession, have emigrated to this country, and have baptized many ministers and others, and of course all who have been baptized by them, have received a regular and valid baptism."

If, for the sake of the argument, we should admit the correctness of all this, it would but partially, if at all, relieve the difficulty. For, if we should demand of the Baptists, individually, to show the soundness of their baptism, by tracing to this, so called, valid source, in the case of ninety-nine out of a hundred, it would prove a perfect failure. And they would have to satisfy themselves by gravely *inferring* that such was the fact in the case—that they had received a valid baptism.

In reference to an *express*, or *positive* pre-

cept, we may have as clear, and as convincing evidence of some truths, by *inference*, *analogy*, or *implication*, as we possibly can by express, or positive declaration. For instance, the Scriptures nowhere say there are a *first* and *second* heaven; but we know certainly there are. How do we know it? By inference Paul says he was caught up to the *third* heavens. There must be a *first* and *second*, or there could not be a *third*. We know there was an outer prison at Philippi, though the Scriptures do not assert the fact. They inform us that Paul and Silas were thrust into the *inner* prison. There must be an *outer* prison, before there could be an *inner* one.

Does God generally employ an *express*, or positive manner in his communication to the children of men? By no means. Look at the prophecies! Look at the dark sayings of David's harp! Look at the instructions of our Savior! He spake in parables to the people. Peter, when on the house-top at Joppa, fell into a trance and saw a sheet let down from heaven full of animals and fowls He was commanded to kill and eat. He was taught to interpret this vision that he should go and preach the Gospel to

the Gentiles. But we think there is an express command for infant baptism in Matt. xxviii, 19: "Go ye, therefore, and teach (μαθητευσατε, *mathèteusate*, disciple) *all nations*, baptizing them," &c. As infants constitute a part of nations, therefore, they are to be discipled by baptism, and afterwards, as they are capable, taught all things, as Christ commanded. That *mathēteusate* means to disciple, no scholar will deny. Christ's Church is a school—Christ the Master—the apostles and ministers the under-teachers, and Christians the disciples, or scholars, together with their infants, who are, at a very early age, capable of being taught the first rudiments of Christianity. Hence the command, "Bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

But the command is to disciple (παντα, panta) *all* (εθνη, ethne) *nations*. The definition of panta is, *altogether*, *totally*, *entirely*, &c. And ethna, *nations*, *people*, *tribes*, &c. Hence, Go ye, therefore, and disciple, *altogether*, *totally*, or *entirely*, the *nations*, *people*, or *tribes* of men, baptizing *them* (nations.) The word autous, *them*, is a definite pronoun, referring to

nations, which includes every human being on the earth. This sense is corroborated by Mark xvi, 15: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to *every* creature." Now, as far as the command to disciple extends, the command to baptize reaches; and both are extensive with human population, irrespective of age or sex. Hence, parents and children are commanded to be discipled and baptized.

The *second* objection is, the want of faith. Our opponents say, "The law of baptism requires faith and repentance in the subject, and as infants cannot repent and exercise faith, they should not be baptized." This is the principal objection to infant baptism; and to many it appears to be a weighty one.

The Scriptures generally relied upon to sustain the above objections, are, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark xvi, 16. "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest," Acts viii, 37. This was spoken to the Ethiopian eunuch—an *adult*. We will state the question in form:

"The Scriptures require faith and repent-

ance, as prerequisites to baptism; but infants cannot believe and repent; therefore, they are not proper subjects of Christian baptism."

We would ask the question, of whom do the Scriptures require faith and repentance? All must *admit*, of *adults*. Then the Scriptures require faith and repentance of adults, as prerequisites of baptism, *and not of infants*.

The sophism of the above syllogism is plain. The error lies in bringing infants in the second or minor proposition, when they are not, nor cannot, by the Scriptures, be brought into the first, or major proposition. For the Scriptures nowhere make such requisitions of infants.

We will now examine the principal text relied upon, which is, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This text has exclusive reference to adults. I will state it in form: He (the adult) that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but some adults *will not* believe; therefore, the unbelieving adult shall not be baptized, or saved. This exhibits the text in its true light.

To make this sophism still plainer, I will state it as our opponents do, namely: "He

(the adult) that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but some adults will not believe; therefore, infants shall not be baptized."

You may now see the sophism more plainly. It consists in placing infants in the conclusion, when they are not in the premises. There should not be more in conclusion than in the premises, because the conclusion is always drawn from the premises.

Look at this text again: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This baptism may have taken place when the person was an *infant.* It does not say, he that believeth and *will* be baptized, but "*is baptized.*" This shows past time. For instance, the man is dead. When did he die? Seventy years ago. Christ is risen from the dead. That took place above eighteen hundred years ago. The man is baptized. When was he baptized? When he was an infant.

The Greek text more clearly shows the correctness of the above view; it is, Βαπτισθεις (baptistheis) the 1. aorist participle of the passive voice, and a literal rendering would be, *having been baptized.* But our opponents say, the first member of the sentence, "believeth," is,

also, a participle, and denotes past time. But it is the 1. aorist participle of the *active* voice. Ὁ πιστευσας και βαπτισθεις σωθησεται—he that believeth *and having been baptized* shall be saved;" for "an article, with a participle, must be translated by the *relative* and *indicative*, as, Ο ερχομενος—he that cometh." (See Valpy's Greek Grammar, p. 185.) It is evident that the translators were governed by this rule. "He that believeth:" "that," is the relative; and "believeth" is the participle, πιστευσας, put in the indicative.

But has the baptism spoken of here any reference to *water* baptism?

The baptism of the Holy Ghost, is the baptism which cleanses and purifies the soul and prepares it for salvation.

As this is the principal objection to infant baptism, let me be a little more particular.

Every argument that opposes an evident truth, and supports a falsehood, must be a bad one. The argument is this: "There are some things said of baptism that do not suit the case of infants, such as faith and repentance; therefore, they are not to be baptized."

We will try this argument on infant circum-

cision, which is an evident truth. God commanded infants to be circumcised. This is not denied. But there are some things said of circumcision that do not suit, or agree with the case of infants. Such as, "circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith," Rom. iv, 11; "He that is circumcised is a debtor to do the whole law," Gal. iii, 3; "And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant," Gen. xvii, 14.

Here are several things said of circumcision, that do not agree with the condition of infants any more than faith and repentance; such as, "*seal of the righteousness of faith*," "*debtor to do the whole law*," "*hath broken my covenant.*"

We might ask the questions: Can a child have righteousness? Can an infant become a debtor to the whole law? And can a young child, only eight days old, break God's covenant? There cannot be an objection urged against infant baptism, but what might have been urged against infant circumcision by the unbelieving Jew.

We will try the argument on the baptism of

Christ. This is an evident truth, for it was performed by his own request. There are some things said of baptism, and especially that of John's, that do not agree with the case of Christ. John's baptism was a "*baptism unto repentance.*" Had Christ faith? Did he repent of sin? He was, and is, the great Author of faith; therefore, he could not exercise *that* faith which is required of sinful man. Could Christ repent? This would presuppose he was a sinner. It is, therefore, evident that there are some things said of Christ's baptism, that no more agree with it than the baptism of infants, such as faith and repentance. To avoid this difficulty, our opponents say, "*Christ was baptized for our example.*" This will not relieve them. For if that were the case, we then would have the example of *one* incapable of faith and repentance. What better example could we have for infant baptism? We do not believe that the baptism of our Savior was the Christian baptism; but as our opponents do, the above is intended as an *argumentum ad hominem.*

We will now try the objection on the salvation of infants. This is a truth admitted by

all. If we are to reject infants from baptism because they cannot believe, we must reject them from salvation for the *same reason*: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." If the argument is good in reference to the first part of this text, it must be good on the latter clause. This would necessarily damn all little children dying in a state of infancy, *as they cannot believe!*

We will now state it in syllogistic form: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but infants cannot believe; therefore, infants shall not be baptized." Well, we will try it on the latter clause: he that believeth not shall be damned; but infants cannot believe; therefore, infants shall be damned!

Two of the gentlemen with whom we have discussed this subject, one a Disciple, and the other a regular Baptist, being pressed with this view of the subject, publicly advocated the doctrine, "*that if infants were ever saved, they were saved by some other system than the Gospel.*" This was the reason that led to the formation of the first society that opposed infant baptism, which was formed, ac-

cording to Dr. Wall, in A. D. 1130, among the Waldenses. They declared that infants were incapable of salvation! He that believeth not shall be damned: infants could not believe, therefore, they must be damned. They accordingly came to the conclusion it was wrong to baptize them. *That* objection to infant baptism, which would necessarily *damn* all little children dying in a state of infancy, should be rejected at once.

The *third* objection, "*What good will it do to sprinkle a little water in the face of an infant?*" We might ask the question, What good will it do to baptize any man, woman, or child, either by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion? No person can see any good in it, except it is to obey the injunction of Heaven. Baptism is administered to fulfill the *will*, or *design* of God, not that we can see any *advantage* in it. Infant baptism must rest on the same foundation. Infants are to be baptized because it is the design of God that they should be, or they are to be rejected, because it was not the design of the great Head of the Church that they should be baptized.

The *fourth* objection: "*It takes away the*

liberty of the child; for when it arrives at mature age, it may not choose to be baptized in the same way. The little infant cannot be conscious of it." What would have been said of a *Jew* who would have said so of circumcision! "What does the child know about it? And when he grows up he may not choose to be circumcised; and by doing so, you are taking away his liberty." He would have been called an infidel, or heathen, and perfectly destitute of every attribute of a Jew, and unworthy of the congregation of the Lord.

We think there cannot be an objection arrayed against the doctrine of infant baptism, but what may be classed under some one of the above objections which we have examined. It is very evident none of them have any merit, but are mere sophisms; therefore, cannot be brought to bear against any testimony, or arguments that may be adduced to establish the doctrine of infant baptism. Having thus cleared away the rubbish, by removing the objections to infant baptism, we will now proceed to raise the superstructure, by presenting some arguments in its favor.

CHAPTER II.

FIRST POSITION: *God had a Church before Christ came, and in it infants were recognized as members.* SECOND POSITION: *The Church which was before Christ came was not destroyed, but was continued down into the Gospel dispensation, and now constitutes the Christian Church.*

IF we shall sustain these positions, we will have proved this fact, namely, *that infants were once proper members of the Church of God;* and if the present Church is but a continuation of the Jewish, or the same Church under the Gospel dispensation, we have another fact, *that infants are proper members of the Church now.* If so, they are to be baptized, because they are members, or to recognize them as such, or to constitute them members. Perhaps in both cases; for, 1. The children of Christian parents, like those of Jewish, were born in the Church. They are then to be baptized because they are members of the Church, and of course would have a right to the Christian name. 2. The children of heathen parents, who are born without the pale of the Church; but when their parents shall embrace the Christian faith, are to be baptized to constitute them members of the Church.

This must be the irresistible conclusion, except our opponents can show that infant membership has been set aside or abolished.

As the argument turns on these points, we will now proceed to establish the first position, namely, *God had a Church before Christ came, which recognized infants as members.* Stephen, just before he was stoned, said of Moses, "This is he that was in the Church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sina, and with our fathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us," Acts vii, 38. This clearly shows there was a Church as far back as Moses; and, doubtless, as far back as Adam, God had a Church. It was rendered visible in the family of Abraham by the rite of circumcision. (See the xii, xv, xvii and xxii of Genesis.) The word εκκλησια, (ekklesia,) used by Stephen, translated *Church*, which is frequently used in the Septuagint translation: for instance, Deut. ix, 10; Judges xxi, 5; Joshua viii, 35, and in many places in the book of Psalms. The word *Church* originally was derived from Κυριου οικος, (Kyriou oikos,) *house of the Lord* which was applied to any house dedicated to

the worship of God. In process of time these words became contracted into *Kyrioik* and *Kyriake*. In the northern part of Europe it underwent another contraction. The Scotch called it *Kirk*, the Germans *Kirche*, the Anglo-Saxon called it *Ciric Kirick*, the Low Dutch *Kerk*. But the Greek word used by the Apostles, is εκκλησια (ekklesia,) which is derived from εκκαλεω, (ekkaleo,) *to call out, or from*—a people called out, or from the common mass of mankind to the worship of God, where the word is preached, and the sacraments are duly administered. Abraham was thus *called out*, who is represented as the father of the faithful.

We are met here with the following objection: namely, "The word '*ekklesia*' is used in Acts xix, 32, also, 39, in reference to an unlawful assembly; therefore, there was no Church in the wilderness." We might with equal propriety say the word "*ekklesia*" is used in the above place to represent a mob, or an unlawful assembly; therefore, there is no Church now. Marvelous logic!

The regular Baptist Church contend that 'God had no Church before Christ's and John

the Baptist's time." This was the position taken in debate with us by one of her distinguished champions. If this position is correct, it follows that all the high priests, with all the holy prophets, with John the Baptist, were heathens; for, where there is no Church, the people are in a state of heathenism.

The covenant which God made with Abraham, as recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis: "As for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee; and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant; to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou,

and thy seed after thee, in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee; Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." This covenant is the grand chart, or constitution of the Church of God. This constituted Abraham the father of all them that believe, and the heir of the world; and was to be an everlasting covenant. This covenant was confirmed in Christ, and, consequently, will continue as long as there shall be a Church on earth. For instance, Paul says, "And this I say, that the

covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ; the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect," Gal. iii, 17. The provisions of this covenant secured a Church state to Abraham and his infant posterity; and as this was confirmed of God in Christ, to be perpetuated as the great constitution of the Church until the end of time, it is, therefore, evident a Church state is secured to believing parents and their infant posterity; for, "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," Gal. iii, 29.

This covenant is frequently referred to by the Scripture as the *covenant*, not covenants. For instance: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed," Acts iii, 25. Also, Zacharias, being filled with the Holy Ghost, did prophesy, saying, "To perform the mercies promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy *covenant*, the oath which he sware to our father Abraham," Luke i, 72, 73. Moses says to the

children of Israel, "That He may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," Deut. xxix, 13. This evidently establishes the fact, that God had a Church before Christ came—a people called out to worship him—"*a people unto himself;*" as he has said unto Abraham, in the great constitution of the Church, "*to be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee;*" "this is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after you; every man-child among you shall be circumcised." Thus was the Church made visible in the family of Abraham by the sacrament of circumcision.

We are met here by our opponents, who say, "that circumcision is only a *national mark* to distinguish the Jews as a nation; and the covenant made with Abraham, as recorded in the seventeenth of Genesis, of which circumcision was made a "*token*" and a "*seal*," has no religious, or spiritual blessings promised in it; it secured only *temporal*, or *political* privileges." In reference to circumcision being only a *national mark*, to distinguish the

Jews from the rest of mankind: Abraham was not only to circumcise himself and his children; but all those that were "born in his house, or bought with his money, must needs be circumcised." If it is only a *national* mark, what nation does it distinguish? All the descendants of Abraham, with all those that were born in his house, or bought with his money, practiced circumcision, making quite a number of nations. For instance, Ishmael and his posterity, that make most of the nations of Arabia and Turkey; the descendants of the *six* sons of *Keturah*, Abraham's second wife· also, Esau and his descendants. But the Church of God was confined to the descendants of Jacob. How, then, can it be a national mark? Which of those nations does it distinguish?

In reference to the covenant with Abraham securing only temporal and political blessings, such as the land of Canaan, a national existence under a theocratical form of government: it is certain temporal and political blessings were secured in that covenant; but God said to Abraham, "*I will be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee.*" Were there no eccle-

siastical, or spiritual blessings promised? Are we to consider this as a promise that God would, in the general, be a God unto them, and that it secured to them only the general blessings of his providence, such as furnishing them with meat, drink, and clothing? Then he promised nothing more to Abraham than what he had promised, in the administration of his government, to all the nations of the earth. But Abraham, Isaac and Jacob understood it differently. They understood it as something promised to Abraham's particular posterity—something more than the common blessings of life; for the Lord said to Jacob, at the time when he changed his name to Israel, "Be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee," Gen. xxxv, 11. That covenant secured to Abraham and that branch of his posterity which inherited the Church state, both temporal and spiritual blessings, just what is secured to the Church under the Gospel dispensation, namely: "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and that which is to come," 1 Tim. iv, 8. The *first* position, we think, is clearly established: that is, "God

had a Church before Christ came; and infants were recognized as members of it." We will now proceed to the *second*, which will be the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER III.

It was a Gospel Church—The name would be changed—Christ shall reign on David's throne—Christ died that the blessings of Abraham might come to the Gentiles—Parable of the vineyard—The house and partition wall—Olive tree—Christ was a minister of the Jewish Church—For this Church Christ died—The gates of the Jewish Church were to remain open to receive Gentile converts—A prophetic view of the Church in the time of its millennial glory—Similarity of expression in the Old and the New Testament—One Lord, one faith, one baptism.

The *second* position, namely, *The Church which was before Christ came, was not destroyed, but was continued down into the Gospel dispensation.* The first argument we shall adduce is, *It was called a Gospel Church.* "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the *Gospel* unto Abraham," Gal. iii, 8. Here we see the Church, which was established in the family of Abraham, was a *Gospel* Church. Paul says to his Jewish brethren, "For unto

us (Jews) was the *Gospel* preached as well as unto them, but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it," Heb. iv, 2. It is, therefore, evident, that the Church which was in Abraham's family, and the Church under Moses in the wilderness, was a Gospel Church.

The name of this Church was to be changed. "And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory; and thou shalt be called by a *new name*, which the mouth of the Lord shall name," Isa. lxii, 2. "And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by *another name*," Isa. lxv, 15. Here it is expressly stated His Church shall be called by a "*new name*," and "his servants by *another name*." That *new name* is, Christian. Compare this prophecy with what Luke says of the Church of Antioch: "And it came to pass, that a whole year they assembled themselves with the Church, and taught much people. And the disciples were called *Christians* first in Antioch," Acts xi, 26.

We are informed by prophecy, that Christ shall reign on David's throne. "The Lord

hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it. Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne," Ps. cxxxii, 11. "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the THRONE of David, and upon HIS kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and justice from henceforth even for ever," Isa. ix, 6, 7. "*David's throne and kingdom*" cannot be his temporal, or political throne and kingdom. That long since has crumbled to the dust. The Savior laid no claims to worldly, or political honors. "My kingdom," says he, "is not of this world." What, then, are we to consider its meaning? It must be an *ecclesiastical*, or *spiritual* throne, or kingdom. This agrees with the annunciation of the angel Gabriel to Mary: "And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the *throne* of

his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i, 31–33. The Savior was to reign as a *King:* "A KING shall reign in righteousness," Isa. xxxii, 1. "The Lord is our lawgiver and our KING." Isaiah xxxiii, 23; "Creator of Israel your KING," Isa. xlv, 15; "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy KING cometh unto thee," Zech. ix, 9. He was to reign over the house of Israel and on the throne of David; consequently, his kingdom was a spiritual, or an ecclesiastical one; as Peter preached on the day of Pentecost: "David, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on HIS THRONE," Acts ii, 30. He, then, is to reign over Zion, or his Church, that is, the Church in the Gospel dispensation, which is called, "*Sitting on the throne of David, and reigning over the house of Jacob for ever.*"

Therefore, it is evident, that the *throne of David, and the house of Jacob*, which was the Church of God among the Jews, was not to be

destroyed; but to be continued down into the Gospel dispensation, forming now the *Christian* Church. This is further corroborated by the prophet Isaiah, when he speaks of the Christian Church: "And in mercy shall the throne be established: *and he shall sit upon it, in truth,* in the *tabernacle* of David," Isaiah xvi, 5. Reigning over Zion, or the Christian Church, is represented by the prophet, as *sitting on the throne in the tabernacle of David*, which shows clearly the identity of the Church before and after Christ came. This agrees with the Revelator, when he says, "And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou *King* of saints," Rev. xv, 3. The Psalmist, when he had a view of the triumphant entry of Christ into heaven, says, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the *King* of glory shall come in," Ps. xxiv, 7.

Christ died that the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles. Paul says, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; * * *

That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ," Gal. iii, 13, 14. What were the blessing of Abraham? "*To be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee.*" That blessing secured to Abraham and his little children a Church state. The public recognition of such a relation was the "*token*," or "*seal*," which was circumcision. This is an express declaration, that Christ died to secure to the Gentile world that which was secured to Abraham: Peter said to the Jews in the temple, immediately after he miraculously cured the impotent man at the beautiful gate, "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed," Acts iii, 25. "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," Gal. iii, 29. Paul further says of Abraham, he shall be "*heir of the world*," "*father of many nations*," and "*father of us all*," Rom. iv. This is further beautifully illustrated by the

Parable of the Vineyard. The Savior says, "Hear another parable; There was a certain

householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a wine-press in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country: and when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it. And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Again he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. But last of all, he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their season. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing,

and it is marvelous in our eyes? Therefore, say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof," Matth. xxi, 33–43. Here, the Church before Christ came is called a "*vineyard.*" The building of the tower, and digging of the wine-press, show the cultivation bestowed upon it. From time to time the Lord sent his prophets. They illy treated them, beating some and killing others. At last he sent his Son. "They will reverence him." But this was not the case; "he came to his own, but his own received him not." That is, Christ came to his own Church, but his own Church received him not. "This is the heir," said those wicked husbandmen, *the Jews*, "let us kill him." They caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When the Lord of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto them? He will miserably destroy those wicked husbandmen, and "*let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen.*" This was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem. Those wicked husbandmen, the Jews, were destroyed, their city left in ruins, their temple service and polity entirely demolished. The vineyard, or

Church, was "*let out*," or given "*unto other husbandmen*," the GENTILES. This, then, clearly proves the point. The Jewish Church, or *vineyard*, was taken from the Jews, and given to the Gentiles, which now constitutes the Christian Church. The Savior says, "The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner." "Therefore, say I unto you, (Jews,) the kingdom (Church) of God shall be taken from you, and be given unto a nation (Gentiles) bringing forth the fruits thereof." Giving and receiving do not imply a *destruction!* What was taken from the Jews? The "*vineyard*," or "*kingdom of God*," or the Church of God, which was before Christ came. What was received by the Gentiles? The *same* vineyard, or Church, which was taken from the Jews. And as that secured to parents membership for their little children, therefore, the Church now secures the *same* privilege. We learn from the above, 1. A Church state was to cease among the Jews. 2. And to be given to the Gentiles. 3. The sameness of that state.

The house and partition wall, throws additional light on the subject. "But now, in

Christ Jesus, ye, who sometime were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances: for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you (Gentiles) which were afar off, and to them (Jews) that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together, for an habitation of God through the Spirit," Eph. ii, 13–22. This agrees with what Paul says, in his letter to the Hebrews, namely: "Wherefore, holy brethren, (Jews,) partakers of the heavenly calling, con-

sider the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, Christ Jesus. Who was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house (Jewish Church.) For this man (Christ Jesus) was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honor than the house. For every house is builded by some man; but he that hath built all things is God. And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, (Jewish Church,) as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after: but Christ as a son over his own house, (Church,) whose house (Church) are we,(Jews,) if we hold fast the confidence, and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end," Heb. iii, 1–6. Here the *two* principal dispensations of the Church are brought to view, namely, the Legal, or Jewish, and the Gospel. Moses, the mediator and lawgiver of the former; and Christ, the mediator and lawgiver of the latter. But it is expressly stated, that Christ was the builder, or founder of the Jewish, as well as the Christian Church. "For this man (Christ) was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he (Christ) who hath builded the

house (Jewish Church) hath more honor than the house. But Christ, as a son (master, or lord) over his own house, (Jewish as well as the Christian Church,) whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." The Church, before the time that Christ made his personal appearance on the earth, was Christ's, but was in a state of *minority;* as Paul says, "Now I say that the heir, (Jewish Church,) as long as he is a *child*, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be *lord* of *all;* but is under tutors and governors until the time (Gospel dispensation) appointed of the father," Gal. iv, 1, 2. Then the Church is to be presented in its *majority*, or in its *perfect form*, to remain so until the Trinity shall bring to a final conclusion the plan of redemption by Jesus Christ.

Before the coming of Christ, the Gentiles were called "*aliens and strangers;*" but now, they are "fellow-citizens with the saints and household of God." Both are to be reconciled unto God, in "one body," or Church; and are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone. This "house," or "building,"

which is the Christian Church, is built on the foundation of the prophets, as well as the apostles. This building, or Church, "*fitly framed together*, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." See how beautifully Gospel institutions and ordinances are *framed* on Jewish *rites* and *ceremonies*. The Jewish Church had two sacraments: namely, the passover and circumcision. The Christian Church, also, has two: the *eucharist* and *baptism*. These take the place of the former. The Lord's supper takes the place of the passover, and baptism, that of circumcision. The passover was typical of the shedding of the blood of the Lamb of God, for the sins of the world; and when that event took place, it could not be continued, but must give way to an institution which would represent the Savior's death as having taken place; which is the province of the eucharist: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," 1 Cor. xi, 26. Again, "For even Christ, our *Passover*, is sacrificed for us; therefore, let us keep the feast," 1 Cor. v, 7, 8. This establishes the fact, that the Lord's supper is *framed* on, or takes the place of the Jewish passover.

Circumcision was a seal of the covenant made with Abraham. The main point, in that covenant, was a future and promised Savior, through the birth of a son, in his old days, to be called Isaac. Circumcision was typical, or emblematical of the *miraculous conception* of the Savior. He was emphatically to be the "*seed of the woman*," not of man. Hence, the rite of circumcision emblematically interdicted the agency of man in the ordinary course of generation, as is shown by Luke, in the facts of the Savior's conception: "Then said Mary unto the angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered and said unto her, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore, also, that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God," Luke i, 34, 35. Circumcision was, then, a "token" of that covenant. It was, also, a sign of the purification of heart: says Moses, "And the Lord thy God will *circumcise thy heart*, and the heart of thy *seed*, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live," Deut. xxx, 6. If, then, circumcision pointed to the miraculous

conception and birth of the Savior, it is evident, when that took place, it could not be practiced without a denial that he had come. Of necessity, it must be succeeded by another institution. It will be recollected, that, after the coming of Christ, the Holy Spirit was to be "*poured out upon all flesh.*" This, then, was the crowning evidence, that the son of Mary was the promised Messiah. John says, "He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Spirit," John i, 33. And as circumcision was a sign of the purification of the heart, so baptism is "*a sign of regeneration, or the new birth.*" Peter beautifully illustrates this, when he says, "The like figure whereunto, even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh,)" [circumcision.]

Circumcision was an institution by which they named a person or child. "And it came to pass, that on the eighth day they came to circumcise the child; and they called him Zacharias, after the name of his father. And his mother answered, and said, Not

so; but he shall be called John. And they said unto her, There is none of thy kindred that is called by this name; and they made signs to his father, how he would have him called; and he asked for a writing-table, and wrote, saying, His name is John. And they marveled all," Luke i, 59–63. "And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called JESUS, which was so named of the angel before he was conceived," Luke ii, 21. "Among the Jews, a child was named when he was *circumcised;* and, ordinarily, the name of the father was given to the first born." (See Dr. Clarke's note on Luke i, 59.) In baptism, the person, or child takes on him his permanent Christian name. It is, therefore, an institution, in the Christian Church, to give a *name.* Hence it is called, "*to Christen.*"

The Sabbath. The Jews observed the *seventh* day of the week, not only in commemoration of the creation of the world, but of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, Deut. v, 13–16. But we, as Christians, observe the first day of the week as our Sabbath, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, an

assurance of deliverance from sin, a greater deliverance than that from the bondage of Egypt. The Christian Sabbath is grafted, or comes in the place of the Jewish: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary to see the sepulchre," Matt. xxviii, 1. In the end of the (Jewish) *Sabbaths*, σαββατων. This is the genitive plural, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, εις μιαν σαββατων. This is also in the genitive *plural*. It should, then, be translated, In the end of the (Jewish) Sabbaths, *as it began to dawn into the first of the Sabbaths*, that is, the first of the *Christian Sabbaths*.

The ministers of the Gospel succeed the priests and Levites; prayer, with a broken and a contrite heart, succeeds the Jewish sacrifices and feasts. All this building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord, in whom ye are also builded together, for a habitation of God, through the Spirit.

Again: "He is our peace, who has made both (Jews and Gentiles) one, and hath *broken down the middle wall of partition between us*." The Church is here represented under

the idea of a building, or house, with a partition wall in it. On the one side of the wall were the Jews, in membership with their little children; and on the other side were the Gentiles. This partition wall, when taken down, would bring Jews and Gentiles together, in one enlarged room. *This formed the first apostolic, or Christian Church.* In this Church were infants in membership—*Jews, with their infant children.* This fact was prophesied by the prophet Joel: namely, "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly: gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that SUCK the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet," Joel ii, 15, 16. The bridegroom was the Savior, and the bride was the Church: it is, therefore, evident the first apostolic, or Christian Church, was formed, or composed, of parents and their little children. The "building," or "house," you will bear in mind, was not destroyed, but was to remain; the partition wall only was to be taken down. How clearly this sustains the fact of the continuation of the Jewish Church.

Our opponents must prove one of *three* things, or their opposition to infant Church membership, and, consequently, infant baptism, must fall to the ground: namely, 1. They must show that infant membership was disannulled, or taken away from the Church, before the coming of Christ, or the taking down of the partition wall. 2. At the time of the taking of it down. 3. Or at some subsequent period.

Will any of our opponents contend, that before the coming of Christ, infant membership was taken away from the Church? And, if so, where is the testimony? Will they say that infant membership was practiced for some time in the Christian Church, and was then disannulled. If so, where is the evidence? And, lastly, was infant membership destroyed at the time of the taking down of the partition wall? Hear Peter, on the day of Pentecost: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, * * * For the promise is unto YOU, and to your CHILDREN, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call," Acts ii, 38, 39. Compare this with that which was promised unto Abraham: "*To be a God unto*

thee, and thy seed after thee." This is the same form of expression, and the same persons are identified: namely, *parents and their infant children.*

There are *three* things to be taken into consideration for a correct understanding of the above: namely, 1. The person speaking. 2. The persons spoken to. 3. The matter, or subject spoken of. 1. The person speaking is Peter, a Jew. 2. The persons spoken to were Jews. 3. He is about to present the Church in its *perfect* form, under the broad commission of its great Head: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them (nations) in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Who compose nations? *Men, women, and children.* Here, then, is a command to baptize *men, women,* and *children.* Peter, then, presents the Church to the world in the same form of expression that God did to Abraham: namely, "*The promise is unto you and your children.*" To Abraham, it was said, "To be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee." He was taught to understand that expression as embracing his infant children; and, as the Jews were in the

habit, for two thousand years, of dedicating their infants to the Lord, and recognizing them as members of the Church by circumcision, they would naturally understand Peter that there was no alteration in the Church in reference to their children; and if Peter did intend to convey the idea, that the children should be cut off from Church membership and privileges, *he has been most unfortunate in the selection of words to convey such an idea.* The Church was to be presented to the Gentiles in the same manner as it was to the Jews: namely, "The promise is unto you and your children."

In the first apostolic, or Christian Church, we have clearly shown that infants were in membership. Now, let our opponents show to the world how they get them out. If they cannot do this, their cause is ruined.

The figure of the olive tree throws additional light on this subject: "For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root (Abraham) be holy, so are the branches. And if some of the branches (unbelieving Jews) be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, (Gentiles,) wert grafted in among them, and

with them (Jews) partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree; (Jewish Church;) boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say, then, the branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, (Jews,) take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to graft them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree?" Rom. xi, 16–24. The apostle, in the eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of this epistle, is showing the call of the Jews to an *ecclesiastical* state; and the forfeiture of that relation, through unbelief; and

that Church state to pass from them to the Gentiles. He presents the whole subject to our view under the *figure* of an "olive tree," which was the Jewish Church. Some of the natural branches (Jews) were broken off through unbelief: the root, trunk, and some of the natural branches, remain. The Gentiles, which were of the "wild olive tree," were grafted into the "*good olive tree*," (*the Jewish Church*,) among the natural branches, and partake of the root (the promises to Abraham) and fatness of the olive tree: that is, the advantages and immunities of the Jewish Church.

Those Jews that embraced Christ by faith, *remained* on the "olive tree," or Jewish Church, as its natural branches: those of the Gentiles, who embraced Christ, were grafted into *this* olive tree, *among the natural branches*. How beautifully and forcibly this shows the connection between the Jewish and Christian dispensations of the Church. The apostles, with, perhaps, the *one hundred and twenty*, with other believing Jews, were the connecting link between those great dispensations of the Church.

The Savior, after his resurrection, gives his great commission to his disciples to *preach his Gospel to every creature, and teach all nations, baptizing them:* they were to *preach repentance, and remission of sins, among all nations.* The commission, then, was to *preach and baptize;* and this was to be done among all nations. Before this time, their labors were to be confined to the Jewish Church. The commission was not to form a *new Church,* but to make disciples and converts for the Church which had been established, which their fathers had lived in from the days of Abraham. In proof of this, in the first sermon which was preached by Peter on the day of Pentecost, *not one word was said about a new organization:* but, "Then they that gladly received his word, were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls," Acts ii, 41. Added unto what? The Church which was then in existence, which was the Jewish.

If the apostle had intended to establish the position entertained by Mr. Campbell and others, that the Jewish Church was demolished, and the Christian Church was built on

the ruins thereof, he doubtless would have said, "That old 'olive tree,' the Jewish Church, which is only a kind of a '*politico-ecclesiastical*' establishment, is to be rooted up, and cast out of the vineyard." But, does he say so? No! Well, what does he say? "The root is holy, also the branches;" and the Gentiles, which are of the "wild olive," are grafted on the good olive tree, among the natural branches, and partake of the root and fatness thereof. There is a time coming, according to prophecy, when the Jews will believe on Jesus of Nazareth, and behold him as their long looked-for Messiah, and shall be gathered into his fold. This is clearly exhibited in the following: "And they (Jews) also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in; for God is able to *graft them in again:* for if thou (Gentiles) wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and wert grafted, contrary to nature, into a good olive tree, how much more shall these, (Jews,) which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree:" that is, the Church from which they were broken off, which was the Jewish Church. Of course, then, that "olive tree," or Church, must re

main, and constitute the Church of God at the time of its millennial glory.

This is further clearly illustrated by Paul: "Whereby, when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto the holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit; that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, (with the Jews,) and of the same body, (same Church,) and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel," Eph. iii, 4–6. And further, "And he (Abraham) received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised;" also, "he should be heir of the world," Rom. iv, 11–18; Gal. iii, 29.

Christ was a minister of the Jewish Church. "Now, I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision (Jewish Church) for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers," Rom. xv, 8. His personal ministry was confined to the Jews; he was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;

"he came to his own, (Church,) but his own received him not;" and, indeed, the ministry of the apostles prior to the crucifixion of the Savior, was confined to the Jewish Church. The Savior commands them, saying, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not. But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," Matt. x, 5, 6. Therefore, the ministry of the Savior, and that of the apostles, was confined to the Jewish Church.

And for this Church Christ died. "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved *the Church*, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse *it* with the washing of water by the word," Eph. v, 25, 26. (See Acts vii, 38.) For what Church did Christ die? That Church which was then in existence: it was to be cleansed and sanctified, and then to constitute the Christian Church. This agrees with what John the Baptist says: "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me (Christ) * * * shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire: whose fan is in his hand and he will thoroughly *purge* his *floor*, (Jew

ish Church,) and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire," Matt. iii, 11, 12. The "*floor*," here, means the Jewish Church, which is emphatically called "his *floor*," or Church, which was to be purged or cleansed, and then given to the Gentiles, to be continued down to the end of time, and not destroyed, as some vainly talk.

The gates of the Jewish Church were to remain open to receive Gentile converts. Hear what the prophet Isaiah says: "Therefore, *thy gates shall be open* continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee (Jewish Church) the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought," Isa. lx, 11. Here we see, that the gates of the Jewish Church are to be open continually, for the *reception of Gentile* converts; therefore, it is to be continued, and become an "*eternal excellency:*" "Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an *eternal* excellency, a joy of many generations," Isa. lx, 15. The *fruit* of this Church is to fill the whole world: "He shall cause them that come of Jacob to

take root: Israel shall blossom and bud, and fill the face of the *world* with *fruit*," Isa. xxvii, 6. Again: "Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear; break forth into singing, and cry aloud, thou that didst not travail with child: for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, (Jewish Church,) saith the Lord. Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtain of thy habitations; spare not, lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes; for thou shalt break forth on the right hand and on the left; and thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles,' Isa. liv, 1–3. Here is a prophecy, that the Jewish Church should enlarge her borders, and inherit the Gentiles. This did not take place before the coming of Christ, as all history shows; and if the Jewish Church were destroyed, *then here is a prophecy which has failed!* Are we prepared to rush into such a conclusion? I presume not. Well, when was Zion's borders enlarged; and when did the Jewish Church inherit the Gentiles? When the Savior gave his disciples their great commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature;" "Go ye, there-

fore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" "And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." This agrees with what the Savior says in commendation of the faith of the centurion of Capernaum: "Verily, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: (Jewish Church:) but the children (Jews) of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness,' Matth. viii, 10–12. This cannot mean the Church triumphant; for those that shall be so happy as to get there, shall never be cast out. "Many shall come from the east and west," &c., has reference to the Gentiles coming into the Church. "Sitting down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom," who were the fathers of the Church, means, to enjoy the blessings secured to them. Therefore, the

kingdom of heaven, or Church, shall remain, but the children of the kingdom, the Jews, shall be cast out.

A prophetic view of the Church in the time of its millennial glory. "The children which thou shalt have, (Gentile converts,) after thou hast lost the other, (Jews,) shall say again in thy ears, The place is too strait for me: give place to me, that I may dwell. Then shalt thou say in thy heart, Who hath begotten me these, (Gentile converts,) seeing I have lost my children, (Jews,) and am desolate, a captive, and removing to and fro? and who hath brought up these? Behold, I was left alone; these, where had they been? Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers," Isa. xlix, 20–23. Here it speaks of the Church having children after she had lost her first children, (the Jews,) and tells how: by "the Lord God lifting up his hand to the Gentiles, and a standard to the people;" and at a

time when *kings* and *queens* shall be nursing fathers and mothers. The prophet represents them coming into the Church, with their little children in their arms. This is further beautifully corroborated by the following: "Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, it was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you (Jews): but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles," Acts xiii, 46. Again: "They shall not labor in vain, nor bring forth for trouble; for they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and *their offspring with them.* And it shall come to pass, before they call, I will answer; and while they are yet speaking, I will hear. The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock," Isa. lxv, 23–25. The prophet is here speaking of the Church at the time of its millennial glory: "The wolf and the lamb shall feed together," &c. And who will compose the Church then? "The seed of the blessed of the Lord, and *their offspring with them.*" "If ye then be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

We now notice *similarity of expression in the Old and the New Testament.* "Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord; for I am married unto you," Jer. iii, 14: "Come hither, I will show thee the *bride*, the Lamb's wife," Rev. xxi, 9. "Give ear, O shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock," Ps. lxxx, 1: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the great shepherd of the sheep," Heb. xiii, 20. "*One Lord, one faith, one baptism*," Eph. iv, 5. "*One Lord*" over the Jewish Church, as well as the Christian. The angel of the Lord, or the Lord God of the holy prophets, was the future Christ. "*One faith:*" the holy prophets had faith in a Messiah to come, who was to atone for the sins of the world. Since Christ has come, the Church believe in a crucified and risen Savior. "*One baptism:*" that, before Christ, was personified by "circumcision of the heart," Deut. xxx, 6, or that state of purification, which is necessary to the entry, and the enjoyment of heaven. The purification of the heart by the Holy Ghost, under the Gospel dispensation, is the same as the circumcision of the heart, which is called, "baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." "For, by

one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." One Lord over the Jewish, as well as the Christian Church; one faith in Christ by both; one baptism, or cleansing operation of the Holy Ghost, in *both*.

We think we have clearly established the positions with which we started out: namely, 1. God had a Church before Christ. 2. That Church was not destroyed, but was continued down into the Gospel dispensation, forming the Christian Church. 3. Infants were recognized in that Church as members. 4. The membership of infants was not abrogated, or disannulled. Therefore, infants are now members of the Church. If so, the conclusion is irresistible, that they have the right to take the *Christian name* in holy baptism.

CHAPTER IV.

Objections to the foregoing: 1. *Mr. Campbell's, from Dan.* ii, 44—2. *I will build my Church*—3. *From Gal.* iv, 21–31: *Cast out*—4. *If children are Church members, and have a right to baptism, they should be admitted to the communion.*

"In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never

be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people," Dan. ii, 44. Mr. Campbell says, "In the days of the iron kingdom shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom. Not the *golden*, the *silver*, the *brazen*, nor *sacerdotal:* these had all been set up." (Debate with M'Calla, p. 97.)

This kingdom to be "*set up*," means the reigning of Christ. This was to be after the manner pointed out in the Scriptures. Hear how the prophet Isaiah describes it: "Of the increase of his government and peace, there shall be no end, *upon the* THRONE *of David*, and *upon his kingdom*, to order it, and to *establish* it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever," Isa. ix, 7. This agrees with the annunciation of the angel Gabriel, a minister fresh from the court of heaven: "And the Lord God shall give unto him (Christ) the *throne* of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke i, 32, 33. Then the reigning of Christ, as a king, was to be on the *throne* of David, and over the house of Jacob. Then, as a matter of course, the *throne* of David and the house

of Jacob must remain. But as we have already examined this point, we will not extend the argument here, but will refer the reader to the decision of the first conference, which met at Jerusalem, over which James presided, as a triumphant refutation of Mr. Campbell's views: "And after they held their peace, James answered, saying, Men and brethren, hearken unto me. Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets, as it is written, (Amos ix, 11, 12,) After this I will return, and will build again the *tabernacle* of David (Jewish Church) which is fallen down, and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will SET IT UP," Acts xv, 13–17. We will now turn and quote from the prophet Amos: "In that day (the coming of Christ) will I raise up the tabernacle of David (Jewish Church) that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and *all the heathen*, which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this," Amos ix, 11, 12.

What Daniel calls setting up the kingdom, or reign of Christ, Amos and James call the setting up the tabernacle of David, or the Jewish Church, which is represented to be in a fallen and corrupt condition; for they had made the commandments of God of none effect by their traditions. Now, mark the manner in which the tabernacle is to be built: "*as in the days of old:*" that is, salvation through Jesus Christ; and membership for believing parents and their infant children. In addition to the above, it is to be built, or repaired, so that it "*may possess the remnant of Edom, and all the heathen.*" How strongly and irrefragably does this sustain the position of the continuation of the Jewish Church into the Gospel dispensation, which forms now the Christian Church! And how beautifully the above shows the connection of the two great dispensations of the Church.

Again: "Upon this rock I will build my Church." "This Church," says Mr. Campbell, "was not the Jewish, for that was built long ago—is yet future—I will build it—build a new Church, not repair an old one." James says: "After this I will return and *build* the

tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and I *will* build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up." James, you are certainly mistaken! You do not mean the tabernacle of David, when you say, "*I will return and build the tabernacle of David:*" that was long ago built! You mean a new one! What the Savior meant by building his Church, the apostle James explains to be the tabernacle of David, or the Jewish Church.

Another objection is taken from Gal. iv, 21–31: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free-woman. But he who was of the bond-woman, was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, (Isa. liv,) Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not;

break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath a husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman."

Mr. Campbell says, "CAST OUT—tremendous words! Cast out the bond-woman—the old covenant compared to Hagar. Disannul it, vacate it, lay it aside, reject it. Is this all? No, no. Cast out the *son of Hagar*, also *the people of the old covenant*." (Debate with M'Calla, p. 249.) The apostle here says to those who desire to be under the law, "Wherefore, then, serveth the law? It was added (to the Abrahamic covenant) because of transgressions, till the seed (Christ) should come" Then it was to be disannulled, which is represented by *Hagar and her son*—the Jews now in bondage, which were to be cast out. Cast out of what? The Church of God made visible in the family of Abraham. But that great

chart, the Abrahamic covenant, was to remain! The Sinai covenant, formed subsequently to it, was only temporary. It was to continue only until Christ should come, and act as a "schoolmaster" to lead us to him. But the Abrahamic covenant was to be an everlasting one! Paul says: "And this I say, that the covenant (Abrahamic) that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, (Sinaic covenant,) which was four hundred and thirty years after, (the Abrahamic covenant,) cannot disannul, (it,) that it should make the promise of none effect," Gal. iii, 17; "But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all," Gal. iv, 26. Have we the correct meaning of the above, when we refer it to the Gospel covenant, as it has generally been done? We think not; and conclude it refers to the Abrahamic covenant, which is the mother of the whole Church.

Mr. Campbell's whole argument is on the supposition that it refers to the Gospel covenant. The Greek word ανω, (ano,) translated *above*, not only means *upward*, *above*, but *antecedently*, or *before*. The apostle here is speaking of *time*, not *position*, or *place*. Well,

we will read it so: "But Jerusalem, (the Abrahamic covenant,) which is *before*, or *antecedent*, (to the Sinaic covenant,) is free, which is the mother of us all." Paul, in his letter to the Jews, further explains this: "For finding fault with them he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, (Jer. xxxi,) when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my covenant, and I regarded them (Jewish people) not, saith the Lord. For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, (Church,) after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people," Heb. viii, 8–10. Here the date of the covenant made with the house of Israel, when the Lord took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt, designates it from all other covenants made with that people. This is called the *Sinaic*. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, I will make a

new covenant with the house of Israel," (Jewish Church.) This is the Gospel covenant. Now, observe, the Sinaic covenant, or the giving of the law, was made with the *house* of Israel. The Gospel covenant was to be made with the *same house of Israel;* therefore, that *house* of *Israel*, or the *Church*, was to stand, but pass into a new dispensation. Daniel says, "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom *shall not be left to other people.*" How strikingly this agrees with what the angel Gabriel says to the Virgin Mary concerning Christ: "He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

The difference between what Paul says in the eighth of Hebrews, and the fourth of Galatians, is this: In the latter, by the allegory of Abraham's two sons, the one by a bond-woman and the other by a free-woman, the Abrahamic and Sinaic covenants are personified. In the former, the Sinaic and Gospel covenants are set forth.

Another objection, which is this: "If children are Church members, and have a right to

baptism, they should, also, be admitted to the *communion* table." It does not necessarily follow, if they are admitted to baptism, that they must be admitted to the eucharist. This point ought to be *proved*, instead of taking it for granted. We deny the position, and call for the proof.

But, in the meantime, in order to throw some light on the subject, let us look at the practice of the Church before the coming of Christ. She had two sacraments, circumcision and the passover—like the Church now, baptism and the Lord's supper. Well, what was the practice of the Church before the coming of Christ? The children of the Jews and proselytes were members of it, and were circumcised. If they were members of the Church, and had a right to circumcision, then they must have had a right to the passover. Was this the fact? No! They were not admitted to the passover, until they were able to understand the meaning of it. The age at which they were admitted was *twelve* years: "And when he (Christ) was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem after the *custom* of the feast, (passover;) and when they had ful-

filled the days," &c., Luke ii, 14, 15. Dr. Clarke says: "Probably this was the *very age* at which the male children were obligated to appear before the Lord at the three public festivals—eight days in the whole—*one* was the passover, and the other *seven* the days of unleavened bread." We clearly discover from this, that it does not necessarily follow they should be admitted to the communion, though they have a right to baptism: they should not partake of the eucharist, until they arrive at that age that they can *discern the Lord's body*, **1 Cor. xi, 29.**

CHAPTER V.

Suffer the little children to come unto me—Proselyte baptism—Example—Children capable of entering into covenant.

"And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them; and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God, (Church.) Verily I say

unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein," Mark x, 13–15; Matth. xix, 13; Luke xviii, 15.

Those little children were of such tender age, that they were brought to the Savior by their parents, and he took them up in his arms and blessed them. The disciples rebuked those that brought them; but the Savior was much displeased at it, and said, "Suffer *the* little children to come unto me, and forbid them not;" meaning, doubtless, *all* little children, *in all future time;* giving, at the same time, a reason to his disciples, which was a *quietus* to all their objections, *that they belonged to his Church*: "For of such is the kingdom of God;" therefore, forbid them not, but suffer them to come unto me. How can we forbid a little child from coming unto the Savior, except it is *ecclesiastically*, or *ceremonially*, or by baptism? Again: how can the Church suffer the little children to come unto Christ, except it is by baptism? But our opponents say, "It means of such like, or adults of child-like disposition; such as *humility*, *meekness*, and *gentleness*." But that is a great mistake; for

we might as well talk of faith and repentance in a child, as humility, meekness, and gentleness. But if adults are to be received, because they are like little children, little children should be received, because they are like themselves. We will illustrate: Suppose a man were to sell his farm for one thousand dollars: the buyer proposes to pay him off by giving him ten bank bills, on a certain bank, of one hundred dollars each, which is acknowledged to be good. But the seller, lest he should be deceived, goes to the bank, and obtains a genuine bill. The buyer comes and pays him down the ten bills, according to contract. The seller then takes them, and compares them with the one he knows to be genuine, and finds they agree, or correspond; he then takes the ten bills, and throws away the sample he obtained from the bank! All would acknowledge he has acted strangely. Yet on this principle our opponents act. They will receive adults in baptism, because they are like "*a little child*," the genuine sample, of whom the Savior says, "Of such is the kingdom of God," and then turn right round and reject the "little child."

This not only shows, that little children are

capable of receiving the kingdom of God, or of entering the Church, but an adult must *receive* it as a little child. Now, how does any person receive the kingdom of God? or, how is he recognized as belonging to the visible Church? All must admit, that baptism is that ceremony; therefore, children ought to be baptized. I will state it in syllogistic language:

Infant children are capable of receiving the kingdom of God, or entering the Church: but none can receive the kingdom of God, or Church, except it is by baptism: therefore, infant children ought to be baptized.

The error of our opponents is this: they put forth an *adult* as the *model*, or *sample*, and say, "Repent, and believe, and be baptized:" but children cannot repent and believe: therefore, they should not be baptized. But the Savior *reverses* it, and puts forth a "little child," as the *model*, or *sample*, and says, "Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God, as a LITTLE CHILD, shall not enter therein." But some of our opponents say, "The kingdom of God means the state of glory in the future world; and little children are fit subjects for it." This is grant

ing them the *greater*, whilst they deny to them the *lesser*. They admit, that children are proper subjects for heaven; but *deny them a place in the road to get there!* Instead of receiving them in the name of Christ, we regret their practice has the appearance of forbidding their coming to the Savior, and a place in the road that leads to a better world.

We learn two facts from the above: 1. That little children are capable of receiving the kingdom of God. 2. But the way and manner that they receive it, is the very way and manner *adults* are to receive it; therefore, no difference should be in the practice of the Church between them, in reference to baptism.

The following will throw additional light on the above: "And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had *taken him in his arms*, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive *one* of such children in *my name*, receiveth me," Mark ix, 36, 37. What does this mean? Why, the *Church*, or pastor, or minister, that receives little children, receives Christ. We ask the question, Do the Baptist Churches, or ministers, receive *little* children in their Churches, in the name of Christ? All

must answer, No! The ceremony of receiving infant children, in the name of Christ, with them, is unknown. But why shall we receive little children in the name of Christ? Let the Savior himself explain. Hear him: "Whosoever shall give you a cup of water to drink in *my name*, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward," Mark ix, 41. Then, to receive them in the name of Christ, is because they belong to him. And if so, they have a right to take upon them the Christian name. This only can be done in holy baptism.

Proselyte baptism. This was practiced, probably, from the time of Moses; therefore, the baptism of children, when the Savior was upon the earth, was not a novelty. When they received a Gentile family into the Jewish Church, the males were circumcised, all were baptized, both males and females, and offered a gift.

As proselyte baptism has been denied by some Baptist authors, I will here introduce some authority.

Calmet (see his Dictionary) says, "The Jews required three things for a complete pros-

elyte, *baptism*, circumcision, and sacrifice; but for women, only *baptism* and sacrifice."

"When a Gentile became a proselyte of righteousness, three ceremonies were used: namely, circumcision, *baptism*, and sacrifice.' (Witsius.)

"The Jews, in our Savior's time, were very sedulous to proselyte the Gentiles to their religion; and when thus proselyted, they were initiated by *baptism*, sacrifice, and circumcision." (Prideaux.)

"The custom of the Jews, in all ages, has been to receive their heathen proselytes by *baptism*, as well as circumcision." (Stackhouse.)

"Whenever Gentiles were proselyted to the Jewish religion, they were initiated by circumcision, the offering of sacrifice, and *baptism*. They were all baptized, males and females, adults and *infants*. This was the *constant practice*, from the time of Moses, to that of our Savior, and from that period to the present day." (Dr. Wall.)

"The apostles knew well, that the Jews not only circumcised the children of proselytes, but baptized them. The children, and even

infants, of proselytes, were baptized among the Jews. They were, in consequence, reputed clean, and partakers of the blessings of the cov enant" (Dr. Adam Clarke.)

"I have always understood that Marmonides is perfectly correct, when he says, 'In all ages, when a heathen (or stranger by nature) was willing to enter into the covenant of Israel, and gather himself under the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon himself the yoke of the law, he must be first circumcised, and secondly, baptized, and thirdly, bring a sacrifice; or, if the party were a woman, then she must be first baptized, and secondly, bring a sacrifice.' He adds, 'At that present time, when (the temple being destroyed) there is no sacrificing, a stranger must be first circumcised, and secondly, baptized.' It does not rest on the testimony of Jewish records solely; it was in circulation among the heathen, as we learn from the clear and demonstrative testimony of Epictetus, who has these words: (he is blaming those who assume the profession of philosophy, without acting up to it:) 'Why do you call yourself a Stoic? Why do you deceive the multitude? Why do you pretend to be a *Greek*, when you

are a Jew? a Syrian? an Egyptian? And when we say any one is wavering, we are wont to say, 'This is not a *Jew*, but acts one. But when he assumes the sentiment of one who has been *baptized* and circumcised, then he both really is, and is called, a Jew. Thus we falsify our profession: are Jews in name; but in reality, something else.'" (Watson.)

Our opponents say: "Where is your example for infant baptism?" Why, we have the example of our heavenly Father himself, in the baptism of the children of Israel in the Red Sea: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," 1 Cor. x, 1, 2. The Jewish nation, when they passed through the Red Sea, was composed of men, women and *children*. They were all baptized unto Moses. That dispensation of the Church was partial—it was confined to a single nation; but when the Church was presented to the world in its perfect form, by the great Head of the same, after his resurrection, he commissioned them as follows: "Go ye, there-

fore, and teach *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The Church was no longer to be confined to the descendants of Jacob, but to extend to *all nations*. Can we conceive of a commission more extensive which has for its object human subjects, than the above? If you wish to know who are proper subjects, or may be baptized, inquire who compose all nations. The answer must be, *men, women, and children*. Then men, women, and children may be baptized. The Savior says, "baptizing them." The pronoun "*them*" has for its antecedent the noun "*nations:*" it is, therefore, evident that the Savior intended to give to his disciples a commission to baptize *children*.

Mr. A. Campbell, instead of making the Savior say, "Go and disciple all nations," makes him say, "Go and make disciples *out* of all nations." But the Greek ἐκ, which is sometimes used to signify *out of*, is not in the text; and had it been omitted by an ellipsis, then the words *panta ta ethne*, in the accusative case, would have been *panton ton ethnon*, in the genitive. Every linguist knows

that the clause, "Go teach all nations," means, "Go disciple all nations."

"We are, also, met with another objection drawn from the Greek text, superior to the former only in absurdity. It is the following: 'The Greek nouns panta ta ethne, *all nations*, are in the neuter; *autous*, them, is in the masculine gender; and, as those words do not agree in gender, then we must look for some noun which agrees with *autous*, and that is the noun *mathetas*, *disciples*, included in the verb *matheteusate*.' We may pronounce, without fear of contradiction, that this objection presents so many glaring grammatical absurdities to any one who understands Greek, that it is utterly unnecessary to offer a single criticism in order to expose them. We will only mention, that a mode of expression similar to that in the text is found in the Greek of Psalms ix, 19, 20. Many more might be added." (Elliott on Baptism, p. 56.)

Children are capable of entering into covenant. "Keep therefore the words of this covenant, and do them, that ye may prosper in all that ye do. Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of

your tribes, your elders, your officers, with all the men of Israel, your little ones, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood, unto the drawer of thy water: that thou shouldest enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day; that he may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob. Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath; but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day," Deut. xxix, 9–15. This covenant was not only binding on the Jewish congregation, at that time, *little children and all*, but in all subsequent time. Again: "In the number of all the males from a *month old* and upward, were eight thousand and six hundred, *keeping* the charge of the sanctuary," Num. iii, 28. If children were once capable of entering into covenant, and were members of the Church of God, it is evident they had all the prerequisite

qualifications, and are *now* capable, through their parents, of entering into covenant relations with their God, and thus be acknowledged and recognized as members of his Church

---

CHAPTER VI.

The practice of the apostles in baptizing whole families—Lydia and her household—The jailer and all his—Children in a state of justification.

THE "Acts of the Apostles," is a very brief history of the acts and doings of those devoted men, merely sufficient to show their doctrine and practice. Their household, or family baptisms, show that it was their uniform custom to baptize whole families on the faith of the parents. There are *nine* cases of baptism mentioned as the acts and doings of those holy men after the resurrection of Christ: *four* of them were family baptisms.

It cannot be supposed that the apostles baptized only those nine cases thus mentioned, but hundreds of others, which are not recorded. This being true, we cannot suppose the four cases of family baptism were the only house-

hold baptisms performed by them. The family baptisms bear the proportion of *four* to five, nearly one half of the whole number. From the above, what is the irresistible conclusion to which we must arrive? Why, it was their uniform practice to baptize *all* the *children* of believing parents. Like the practice among the Jews: when a heathen came into the Church, he came with all his family, as we have already shown. How strikingly this accords with the practice of the Pedo-Baptist Churches! When a heathen, or any other person, renounces the world, and professes faith in Christ, he comes into the Church, with all his children. This is not the practice of the Baptist Churches. The language would not be suitable to their operations. To say, "such a man believed, and he, and all his household, or children, were baptized," does not apply to Baptist Churches.

There is no doubt but every member of those families mentioned above was baptized; and if there were any infant children in any of them, they were of course baptized; and if they were not baptized, doubtless, that exception would have been made. For instance

"And the man Elkanah, and all his house, went up to offer unto the Lord the yearly sacrifice, and his vow. But Hannah went not up; for she said unto her husband, (Elkanah,) I will not go up until the child be weaned, and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and there abide for ever," 1 Sam. i, 21, 22. It is represented, that those families were baptized on the faith of the parents, which presupposes that those households were composed, in part, of infant children; for, if they were all adults, it is reasonable to suppose that something would have been said of their faith, and repentance, &c. Another important idea is the following: The apostolic age lasted about sixty years; and in all the acts and doings of the apostles, we have no account of the baptism of any adult person who was brought up by *Christian parents!* How are we to account for this? Only on the supposition that it was the universal practice of the apostles to baptize whole families—all the children of believing parents; and when they would arrive at adult years, there would be none to be baptized.

We will examine some of those household

baptisms more particularly: "And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshiped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there," Acts xvi, 14, 15.

It is evident Lydia was a householder, had a family, and they were baptized on her faith: *the Lord opened her heart*, "that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." Baptism, doubtless, was explained and enjoined. She said: "If ye have judged me (not us) faithful to the Lord, come into MY house, and abide there." How were they to judge of her faithfulness? From the fact that she believed, and went forward in baptism, and then had her household, or children, baptized. This is a pretty strong case of infant baptism.

Our opponents find great difficulty in making out a family for Lydia without allowing her children. They say, "She was from Thyatira, and carried on a coloring, or dying estab

lishment, in Philippi, and her household consisted of journeymen dyers." If so, they were baptized on the faith of Lydia! The Lord opened Lydia's heart, and then Paul and Silas took those gentlemen journeymen dyers and baptized them!

The baptism of the jailer and his family. "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway," Acts xvi, 33. The jailer was convinced of the truth of the Christian religion by the miraculous display of divine power in the earthquake, and in the opening of the prison doors, and, at the same time, the prisoners not escaping. He exclaimed: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" They told him to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and he and all his house should be saved. He then took them out of the *inner* prison into the outer; and Paul preached to all them that were present the word of the Lord; and then the jailer, the same hour of the night, washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. What is the natural construction of the phrase, "all his?" Why, his family of children; and

the probability is there were some small children, from the fact he was a *jailer*, which was an office of one who was in the prime of life.

Our opponents object to the above view, and say: "And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." They wish to make the impression that the sentence, "and rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house," means all were adults, and capable of rejoicing and believing. But reference to the Greek text will clearly disprove the above. The word *rejoice*, ηγαλλιασατο, is in the middle voice: 1. a. 3. per. sin. ind., which is from αγαν, *very much*, and αλλομαι, *to leap*, which means, *to leap for joy, show delight by gestures, to exult, rejoice, triumph.* As it is in the middle voice, and singular number, the action, or rejoicing, is confined to the jailer: he leaped for joy, or rejoiced: that is, the jailer himself leaped, and shouted aloud for joy.

In reference to *believing*, πεπιστευκως, which is a perfect active participle, in the singular number, and masculine gender; and a literal translation would be: he (the jailer) *having*

believed, rejoiced in God, with all his house. Nothing is said of believing and rejoicing, only as it refers to the jailer *himself*.

The regular Baptist Church baptize on a profession of faith in Christ: that is, the candidate must be in a state of *justification*. Mr. Campbell and his disciples baptize *for the remission of sins*. Mr. Campbell says, "The believer rises out of the water, *is born of water*, enters the world a second time—he enters it as innocent, as clean, as unspotted as an angel." (Debate with M'Calla, p. 137.) These different opinions, entertained by the several sects of the Baptists, at present we shall not notice, but will leave them to settle those difficulties among themselves.

But, if the position is correct, that the proper candidate for baptism should be in a state of justification, what better argument can we have for infant baptism? For infants are, also, in a state of justification. Paul says: "Therefore, as by the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life," Rom. v, 18. Here is proof that *all men*,

when in a state of *infancy*, are in a state of *justification* of life: therefore, if adults are to be baptized, because they are in a state of justification, infants should, also, be baptized, because they are in the same state. I will state it in syllogistic language: All persons that are in a state of justification, are proper subjects of Christian baptism: infants are in a state of justification, therefore, infants are proper subjects of Christian baptism.

Church members are called by the Greek word αγια, *(agia,)* or "holy," Eph. i, 1; Phil. i, 1; Col. i, 2; 1 Thes. v, 27; Rom. viii, 27; Eph. vi, 18; Rom. xii, 13, xv, 25; 2 Cor. viii, 4, ix, 12. This term, also, is applied by Paul to children: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the (believing) wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the (believing) husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they (αγια) holy," 1 Cor. vii, 14. The question, doubtless, was propounded to Paul to determine the relation of children to the Church where only one parent was a believer: "The children of believing parents I know are members of the Church, and have a right to baptism; but what relation does *mine*

sustain: my wife, or my husband, is an unbeliever?" The apostle says the marriage relation is sanctified by the believing parent, and their children sustain the same relation to the Church as if both parents were believers. The term "unclean" is used in reference to the heathen, and others, who were either literally, or legally so; therefore, were unfit for the congregation of the righteous, and sanctuary of the Lord. The term "holy" must mean a literal, or natural holiness, or an ecclesiastical, or ceremonial holiness; and, as our Baptist friends do not contend for a literal, or natural purity, or holiness of infants, then it must mean they are ceremonially holy. If so, surely they have a right to that ordinance, or ceremony, which represents that state: namely, BAPTISM.

CHAPTER VII.

No controversy on infant baptism in the first ages of the Church—History of infant baptism.

In the first ages of the Christian Church there were schisms, and divisions, and controversies, perhaps on almost every point in

theology. Many of those controversies have been preserved. But one thing is remarkable: there was none on the subject of infant baptism! There is a perfect silence on that subject. How are we to account for it? Why, they were all of one mind. It was admitted by all that infants should be baptized, and that by the command of the apostles

Mr. Campbell says: "Tertullian was the first man that mentions infant baptism, and he opposed it." Tertullian flourished A. D. 204, a little over one hundred years after the apostles; for it is believed John wrote his Gospel A. D. 99, or 100. It is evident, if infant baptism were introduced into the Church as an INNOVATION upon the law of baptism, it must have been done between the time of the apostles and Tertullian—a space of a little more than one hundred years! Mr. Campbell says: "Yes, of 44 writers, called orthodox, besides a *great* many called heterodox, who lived, and taught, and wrote, from the apostle John's time till the time of Tertullian, not one mentions infant baptism." (Debate with M'Calla, p. 366.)

What do we learn from the above admis-

sion? That Tertullian was the first to mention infant baptism, as then being practiced in the Church. We, then, are enabled to trace infant baptism back within *one hundred* years of the time of the apostles, from the showing of our opponents. It is evident, if infant baptism were introduced into the Church as an *innovation*, it must have been *between the time* of John the divine and Tertullian. Mr. Campbell says, in that time *forty-four* orthodox writers, besides a great many others, lived, taught, and wrote, and *not one of them mentions infant baptism.* Is it possible that those writers could have beheld infant baptism come into the Church as an *innovation*, and not *one* of them, out of so *many*, raise a warning voice! Many of those writers were baptized, perhaps, by the apostles themselves; their fathers associated with those holy men, and conversed freely with them on every subject connected with our holy religion. Perhaps some of those writers *themselves* had the distinguished privilege of an acquaintance with them, and had heard them teach and preach the doctrines of Christ; and it is very probable many of them died martyrs to the cause

of Christianity. Can it be supposed that those *forty-four* orthodox writers, with a great number of others, could have seen infant baptism come into the Church as an *innovation*, without some *one* of them declaring against it!

Lay prejudice aside, the case is a plain one. We have traced infant baptism back so nigh the apostles' time as one hundred years, by the testimony of our opponents themselves. If, then, it ever were introduced into the Church as an *innovation* upon the design of baptism, is it probable, or even possible, those writers could have witnessed it without declaring against it? It is very evident those writers did not view infant baptism as our opponents do, or they would at once have denounced it. Did you ever hear an effort made by a Baptist on the subject of baptism, without his denouncing infant baptism in very plain, and sometimes severe terms?

Mr. Campbell says: "Tertullian opposed infant baptism." Not absolutely so. He only advised the delay of the baptism of infants, as well as that of *unmarried* persons. From the superstitious notions which he had conceived concerning its efficacy, he believed it to be a

saving ordinance: it washed away all sin; therefore, the *nigher* baptism came to death the better. Tertullian admits, if a child were in danger of dying, *it should be baptized.*

—

HISTORY OF INFANT BAPTISM.

SECOND CENTURY.

"JUSTIN MARTYR, who was converted to Christianity A. D. 132, and suffered martyrdom A. D. 167, represents baptism coming in the place of circumcision. In his apology for the Christians before the emperor Antonius Pius, near the beginning, he has these remarkable words: 'Several persons among us, sixty and seventy years old, and of both sexes, who were discipled (εμαθητευθησαν, ematheteuthesan) to Christ in their *childhood*, and remain uncorrupted.' This is the same word made use of in the great commission to baptize: Go and make disciples (μαθητευσατε, matheteusate) all nations; and the mode to make disciples was by baptism; and this was done, says Justin Martyr, in their *childhood.* The time they were *discipled* was about the middle of the apostolic age. This must be a clear proof of infant baptism at the time of the apostles."

"IRENÆUS, a disciple of Polycarp, who was

a disciple of John the divine, says: 'Christ came to save all persons who are regenerated unto God: *infants*, little ones, youths, and elderly persons.' That by the word *renascor*, to regenerate, he means baptism, is plain from his use of the word in another place, where he says: 'When Christ gave his apostles the command of *regenerating* unto God, he said, Go teach all nations, baptizing them.'"

THIRD CENTURY.

"ORIGEN says: 'Infants, by the usage of the Church are baptized. Infants are baptized for the remission of sins. Infants are baptized, because, by the sacrament of baptism, our pollution is taken away. The Church had an order, or tradition, from the apostles to give baptism to infants.' (Rom. viii, in sec. 12, Com. in Epis. ad Rom. lib. 5.) Origen was born about A. D. 184, and died A. D. 252, was of Christian parents, a man of extensive learning and acquaintance with the customs of the Church. He speaks of baptism of infants of universal usage."

THE COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE.—"Fidus, an African Bishop, applied to Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, to know, not whether infants were

to be baptized, but whether their baptism might take place before the eighth day after their birth, that being the day on which circumcision was performed by the law of Moses. This question was considered in an African Synod, held A. D. 254, at which sixty-six bishops were present, and it was unanimously decided, 'that it was not necessary to defer baptism to *that* day; and that the grace of God, or baptism, should be given to all, and especially to infants.'"

Can it be supposed that a council, or conference of sixty-six grave bishops, sitting only about 154 years after the apostles' time, could unanimously decree that the grace of baptism should be given to all, especially to infants, without infant baptism being of apostolic origin!

FOURTH CENTURY.

"AMBROSE, who died in A. D. 375, when commenting on Luke i, 17, says: 'But, perhaps this may seem to be fulfilled in our time, and in the apostles' time; for that returning of the river waters backward toward the spring head, which was caused by Elias, when the river was divided, (as the Scripture says Jor-

dan was driven back,) signified the sacrament of the laver of salvation, which was afterwards to be instituted, by which those *infants* that are baptized are reformed back again from wickedness, or a corrupt state, to the primitive state of their nature.' "

"GREGORY NAZEANZEN, who died A. D. 389, declares, in his discourse on baptism, 'that infants are to be baptized to consecrate them to Christ from their infancy.' "

FIFTH CENTURY.

"The fifth Council of Carthage, held A. D. 401, declares in her 72d canon, 'that children ought to be baptized, when there is no proof, nor testimony, that they have been already baptized.' "

"CHRYSOSTOM, who died in A. D. 407, says, (in his Hom. de Bapt. Christi,) 'Persons may be baptized, either in their infancy, in middle age, or in old age.' "

"PELAGIUS, in his letter to Innocent, Bishop of Rome, says: 'We hold one baptism, which we say ought to be administered with the same sacramental words to *infants*, as it is to elder persons.' We have, also, the following from him: 'Men slander me, as if I denied the

sacrament of baptism to infants, or did promise the kingdom of heaven to some persons without the redemption of Christ, which is a thing that I never heard not even any wicked heretic say.' Pelagius is a witness of high authority. He was a man of talents, and extensive learning. He, also, traveled over a great part of the Christian world. Add to this, his heretical doctrine of the purity of human nature, which, according to the views of that age respecting baptism, was logically opposed to infant baptism, yet he speaks of it as practiced everywhere, as a custom which no one denies."

"Cœlestius, of the same sentiments, and fellow-traveler with Pelagius, when on his trial before the Council of Carthage, in A. D. 410, says, 'As for infants, I always said that they stood in need of baptism, and that they ought to be baptized.' 'Infants are to be baptized according to the rules of the universal Church.'"

"Jerome, who died A. D. 420, says, 'If infants be not baptized, the sin of omitting their baptism is laid to their parents' charge.'"

"Augustine, who died A. D. 430, declares: 'Infant baptism the whole world practices; it

was not instituted by councils, but was *ever in use.* The whole Church of Christ has constantly held, that infants were baptized for the remission of sins. Let no one so much as whisper any other doctrine in your ears: this the Church has *always had*, has *always held.* I have never *read*, or *heard*, of any Christian, whether Catholic or sectary, who held otherwise.' "

"AUSTIN. 'Which the whole body of the Church holds, as delivered to them, in the case of *little infants baptized*, who cannot yet believe with a heart to righteousness, or confess with the mouth to salvation, as the thief could; nay, by their crying and noise, while the sacrament is administering, they disturb the holy mysteries, and yet no Christian man of any sort will say they are baptized to no purpose.' " (See Watson and Elliott on Baptism.)

All history, in reference to this subject, goes to establish the practice of infant baptism by the *whole* Christian world. Pelagius expressly says, he "*never heard not even a wicked heretic say*" it was wrong to baptize infants. He was a man distinguished for his learning and his travels over the Christian world. Au-

gustine says, he "*never read*, or *heard*," of any person who denied baptism to infants: then, certainly, there could not have been any Baptists at that age of the Church.

"At the end of the fourth century, the famous controversy took place between Augustine and Pelagius concerning original sin, in which the uniform practice of baptizing infants, from the days of the apostles, was admitted by both parties, although they assigned different reasons for it." (Watson.)

This was only about three hundred years after the apostles' time. Those learned men were well acquainted with the history of the Church during that period, as well as with the doctrines and practice of the apostles, and they both not only admitted it was the constant practice of the Church, but they *never read*, or *heard*, of any person who said it was wrong to baptize infants.

It is now a little over three hundred years since the *Reformation* took place under Luther, Melancthon, Zwingle, and others. Can we now be mistaken as to the doctrines taught by those devoted men, or their practice? No! They attacked the doctrine of *transubstan*

tiation, and contended that the laity should have the *cup* as well as the bread, and they practiced accordingly. They, also, attacked the *celibacy* of the *priests*, both by precept and example. The whole Christian world are well acquainted with the practice and doctrines of those holy reformers; so were those devoted fathers of the Church, which we have quoted, living in the *second*, *third*, *fourth*, and *fifth* centuries, well acquainted with the doctrines and practice of the apostles and primitive Church. They all declare it was the uniform practice of the Church, from the apostles down, to baptize infants. It is impossible to account for this *unanimity*, except on the supposition that the *doctrine* and *practice* of infant baptism was of apostolic origin.

During the first four centuries of the Christian Church, there were divisions, and parties, and controversies, on almost every point of theology and usage of the Church; but not a word of dispute on the subject of infant baptism! This is only accounted for on the ground that infant baptism was the constant and universal practice of the Church from the Savior down.

Look at the *three* great divisions of the primitive Church: namely, the Syriac, the Greek, and the Latin. *These all practiced infant baptism, in every period of their history, down to the present time.* Our opponents say, "Infant baptism is a relic of Popery, and that Pedo-Baptists get their history from that corrupt establishment." We have thought, when we have heard them palm that on their congregations, they could not be honest, or were profoundly ignorant of the subject. You will observe, that of all the authority we have brought forward, *not one* has been from the Roman Catholic Church, but all lived and wrote some centuries before the Bishop of Rome was declared universal Bishop, which was A. D. 606; and this was the same year Mohammed wrote the Alkoran.

I will only bring forward one more witness on this point. The celebrated Dr. Wall, "who studied thoroughly the history of baptism, and who, as to the mode, was even a *Baptist*, gives us, in his history of baptism, the following summary, as the result of his researches:" "For the first four hundred years after Christ, there appears only one

man (Tertullian) who advises the delay of infant baptism in some cases, one Gregory, who did, perhaps, practice such delay in the case of his own children; but no society of men so thinking, or so practicing, or any one man saying it was unlawful to baptize infants; so, in the next *seven hundred* years, there is not so much as one man to be found, who either spoke for, or practiced such delay, *but all to the contrary*. And when, about the year 1130, one sect among the Waldenses, or Albigenses, declared against the baptism of infants, as being *incapable of salvation*, the main body of that people rejected their opinion, and they of them who held that opinion, quickly dwindled away, and disappeared; there being no more persons holding that tenet until the rising of the German Anabaptists in the year 1522."

Mr. Watson says, according to Bishop Tomline, the first Baptist Church was formed in England in 1640. The first in the United States was in 1638.

Our Baptist brethren, we see from the above, have just come into the vineyard—a *sect of but yesterday;* but from the *prerogative* they take, and boasting dogmas they constantly ex-

hibit, wish to make the impression that they have had an existence for a long time.

Now, in conclusion, whether do the Baptist, or the Pedo-Baptist Churches, resemble heaven most? Look on those high and lofty plains of glory: there you see little children and their parents associated together. Look to the throne: there you will see infant children bowing with their parents, and crying, "Amen, alleluiah, the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." Hearken to the song of Moses and the Lamb! How beautifully *infant* voices symphonize with the voices of that innumerable company, having come up through much tribulation, and made their robes white in the blood of the Lamb!

Now, look to the different branches of the Pedo-Baptist Church: the Presbyterians, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Methodists, United Brethren, Seceders, Evangelical Association, German Reform, and all other branches. There you will see *little children* in membership with their parents. Look, now, to the different branches of the Baptist Church. No infants there in membership with their parents! Which has the greater resemblance to heaven, the Baptist, or the Pedo-Baptist Church?

PART II.

MODE OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

Definition of Bapto and Baptizo.

THERE is, perhaps, no subject in theology so much discussed, at present, as the mode of Christian baptism. Some are wont to make the mode essential to baptism, whilst others wish to make both the mode and baptism itself essential to salvation.

Our Baptist brethren say, "Immersion is essential to baptism, and without baptism (immersion) you do not belong to the Church of Christ." Mr. Campbell and his disciples not only contend for the above position, but go farther, and say, "Without immersion there is no remission of sins, or salvation."

From the high ground taken by them, it is a matter of importance to the Pedo-Baptist Churches, and the public in general, to have the subject carefully examined, and their errors exposed, and thus disabuse the public mind; especially as immersion is made the foundation of that very reprehensible system of *prose-*

lytism, so universally practiced by every immersionist sect; for, it appears, they wish to sustain themselves by making converts to *this* peculiarity of their creed, as if it were the *Alpha* and *Omega* of religious duty.

Suppose a person is concerned for the welfare of his soul, their first object is to direct his attention to their views on baptism, and urge on him a speedy compliance, and be received into their Church, and then the great work of salvation, at present, appears to be accomplished! Or, if members of the Pedo-Baptist Church shall occasionally attend their meetings, or shall associate with them, their first object will be to repudiate, or overthrow their baptism. The whole effort of this *labor of love* will be to show them they are *unbaptized*. If they shall be so fortunate as to succeed in unsettling them on this point, they are ready to immerse them, and receive them into their Church.

We believe the mode of baptism, as taught in the Scriptures, and practiced by the apostles, was by *aspersion*, or *affusion:* that is, they applied the water to the candidate; therefore, they baptized WITH water, and not IN

water. The difference between the practice of the apostles and the Baptist Churches is this: the former baptized *with* water, and the latter baptize in water. To baptize by immersion, you apply the candidate to the water, and, consequently, baptize *in* water. It cannot be said, after a person was baptized by immersion, that he was baptized *with* water, but was baptized *in* water; but it would be correct to say a person was baptized *with* water, where the water was applied to him. Whenever the Scriptures speak of the baptism of water, whether as practiced by John, or the apostles, it is said, "*baptized with water.*" And, verily, to baptize with water, the water must be applied to the subject; but to baptize by immersion, the subject is applied to the water.

There is a rule of the Greek language, which, in our mind, settles the mode of baptism beyond a doubt, which is this: namely, "The *instrument* and *manner* of an action are put in the dative case: as, Αργυρεαις λογχαισι μαχου και παντα κρατησεις, oracle to Philip: *fight with silver weapons*, and you will conquer the world." (See Valpy's Greek Grammar, p. 192.) Throughout the New Testa-

ment, in every place where it speaks of the baptism of water and the Holy Ghost, and the washing of persons and things with water, the water and the Holy Ghost are always put in the dative case; therefore, the preposition εν, which is generally in connection, and is translated *with*, is a correct translation: the *instrument* of the action of baptism is *water*, and the *manner* is *with*; therefore, it was applied to the subject. Should it be said a school teacher corrected his scholars with a rod, all would immediately understand him as having done it by applying the rod to them, and not the scholars to the rod. A limner painted a picture with paint; the paint was applied to make the picture: a man cut down a tree with an axe; the axe was applied to the tree: John baptized the people *with* water; he then, of course, applied the water to them.

This rule of the Greek language should settle the dispute about the mode of baptism in every candid mind. We Pedo-Baptists have been on the defensive long enough: it is high time we should buckle on our armor, and boldly step forth and attack this insidious error that lurks around the walls and bulwarks

of our Zion, and rout him, and put him to death with the sword of truth.

The first position taken by them is from the meaning of the word used in this ordinance, which is βαπτιζω, derived from βαπτω, its root. They are words of but "one meaning," as they say; "and that is, to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerse;* and that these words are never used in the Scriptures, nor in classic Greek, except in the sense of *immersion*, or in a secondary sense, to *color*, or *stain*, from having been immersed." The conclusion they draw is this: "If the Savior and the apostles made use of, and selected a word of but *one* meaning, in the ordinance of baptism, and that is *immersion*, then immersion is the only mode of baptism."

This position is either true or false. If it is true, the argument is a strong one; but, if false, then they will be found deceiving and misleading the public mind. As this is the main pillar which supports their system, permit us to approach it, and if we succeed in bearing it away, their whole superstructure must fall to the ground. They are exuberant in their quotations from learned authors and Greek lexicons. We will, also, introduce some:

Schrevelius, that great master of the Greek tongue, gives four definitions: "Baptizo, mergo, abluo, lavo: to baptize, to immerse, to wash, to sprinkle, wet, or moisten."

Schleusner (see his Lexicon on the N. T.) defines baptizo, 1. "To immerse in water. 2. To wash, *sprinkle*, or cleanse with water. 3. To baptize. 4. To pour out largely."

Scapula (see his Lexicon) defines baptizo, "to immerse, wash, *sprinkle*."

Hedericus (see his Lexicon) defines baptizo, "to immerse, wash, *sprinkle*."

Parkhurst (see his Lexicon) defines baptizo, "to immerse in, or wash with water, in token of purification of sin."

Ainsworth (English and Latin Dictionary) defines it, "to wash any one in the sacred baptismal font, or to *sprinkle* on him the consecrated water."

Buck (see his Dictionary) says, its "radical, proper, and primary meaning is, to tinge, to dye, to wet, or the like, which primary design is effected by different modes of application."

Cole (see his Lexicon) defines it, "to baptize, to wash, to *sprinkle*."

Passor (see his Lexicon) defines it, "to immerse. wash, *sprinkle.*"

Suidas (see his Lexicon) defines it, to immerse, moisten, *sprinkle.*

Conler (see his Lexicon) defines it, by immersion, washing, sprinkling, or wetting.

Stephanus (see his Lexicon) defines it, "to immerse, wash, cleanse, or *sprinkle*," (mergo, abluo, lavo.)

Leigh (see his Lexicon, i. e., Critica Sacra) defines it, "a kind of washing, as by plunging; and yet it is more largely taken for *any kind of washing*, where there is no *dipping* at all." This is a very important witness, as he was an immersionist.

Wahl (see his Lexicon) defines it, 1. "To wash, to perform ablution, to cleanse. 2. To immerse, to administer the rite of baptism." This lexicographer gives immersion as its secondary meaning, and to *wash* as its primary.

Dr. George Hill, principal of St. Mary's College, who was eminently a learned man, says, "Both *sprinkling* and immersion are implied in the word *baptizo;* both were used in the religious ceremonies of the Jews, and both may be considered as significant of the

purposes of baptism." (Hill's Divinity, p. 659.)

John Wesley says, "The *matter* of this sacrament is water, which, as it has a natural power of cleansing, is the more fit for this symbolical use. Baptism is performed by *washing*, *dipping*, or *sprinkling* the person in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who is hereby devoted to the ever-blessed Trinity. I say, by *washing*, *sprinkling*, or *dipping;* because it is not determined in Scripture in which of these ways it shall be done, neither by any express *precept*, nor by any such example as clearly prove it, neither by the force or meaning of the word baptism."

Calvin says, "Whether the person baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or not, or whether water be only poured, or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance."

Dr. Doddridge, who had strong partialities for immersion, says, "Baptizo may signify any method of washing, and *is* sometimes used in Scripture, for washing things which were not *dipped* in water, but on which it was poured, as, Luke, xi, 38; Mark, vii, 4."

Johnson says, "Baptize, to Christen."

Walker (see his Dictionary) says, "Baptize, to administer the sacrament of baptism, *sprinkle*, plunge."

Webster (see his Dictionary) says, "Baptism, the application of water to a person, as a sacrament or religious ceremony."

Grove (see his Greek Lexicon) defines βαπτω, "to dip, plunge, immerse, to wash, to wet, moisten, *sprinkle;* to steep, to imbue, to dye, to stain, color." This is the root of βαπτιζω, the word used in the ordinance of baptism, which, according to Grove, means, "to dip, immerse, immerge, plunge; to wash, cleanse, purify; to *baptize*, to depress, humble, overthrow."

Dr. Adam Clarke says, "Were the people dipped, or sprinkled? for it is certain, bapto and baptizo mean both." (See Com. on Matt. iii, 6.)

Professor Stuart, after a full examination of the meaning of the word baptizo, says, "I do conceive it quite plain, that none of the circumstantial evidences (in the Bible) prove immersion to have been exclusively the mode of Christian baptism, or even that of John. Indeed I conceive this point so far made out,

that I can hardly suppress the conviction, that if any one maintains the contrary, it must be either because he is unable rightly to estimate the nature, or power of the Greek language; or because he is influenced in some measure by *party feelings;* or else, because he has looked at the subject in only a partial manner." (See Bib. Rep., p. 337.)

We have seen that lexicographers do not give to baptizo, *immersion*, as its exclusive meaning, we will now see whether its classic use is exclusively immersion. So far as the mode is concerned, it is admitted that bapto and baptizo have the same meaning. We will give a few cases from bapto.

Hippocrates says, "When it drops upon the garments, (*baptetai*,) they are dyed." How were the garments dyed? By some coloring fluid *dropping* on them.

In *Arian's* expedition of Alexander the Great, "Nearchus relates that the Indians (baptontai, baptize) dye their beards." It will not be contended they dyed their beards by immersion.

Ælian, speaking of an old coxcomb who endeavored to conceal his age by dying his hair, says, "He endeavored to conceal the

hoariness of his hair by dying *(baphe, baptizing)* it."

Homer, in his battle of Frogs and Mice, uses the following language: "He breathless fell, and the lake was tinged (ebapteto, baptized) with blood." Surely the lake was not immersed in the blood of one of those little animals!

Aristophanes says, "Magnes, an old comic actor of Athens, used the Lydian music, shaved his face, and smeared (baptomenos, *baptized*) it over with tawny washes."

Aristotle speaks of a substance which, "if it is pressed, dyes (*baptei*, *baptizes*) and colors the hand."

We will now show the classic use of baptizo

Plutarch, relating the stratagem of a Roman general, a little before he died of his wounds, says, "He set up a trophy, on which, having baptized (*baptisas*) his hand in blood, he wrote this inscription, &c." Here, doubtless, some blood was put on his finger, or his finger was put in blood, and he wrote, &c.; and this is called baptizing his hand, when a very small part of his hand had blood on it.

Hippocrates directs, concerning a blister plaster, if it should be too painful, "to baptize,"

or moisten it with breast milk, or Egyptian ointment." Here it means to sprinkle a little breast milk on it; for since the days of old mother Eve, it has never been known that a blister plaster has been immersed in breast milk. Hippocrates was a Greek physician. Dr. Gale, a learned immersionist, furnishes us with the following:

Aristotle says, "The Phœnicians, who inhabit Cadiz, relate, that sailing beyond Hercules' Pillars, in four days, with the wind at east, they came to a land inhabited, whose coast was full of sea-weed, and is not overflowed (*baptizesthai*, *baptized*) at ebb; but when the tide comes in, it is wholly covered." Here the land could not have been put in the water, but as the water flowed over it, the coast was baptized. Here baptizo does not express the action for which immersionists contend. With them it always means to immerse, or put in water.

We will now prove by Mr. Carson, a learned and zealous immersionist, that the views of the immersionists are not sustained by lexicographers and commentators. Mr. Carson's language is as follows: "My position is, THAT

IT (*baptizo*) ALWAYS SIGNIFIES TO DIP; NEVER EXPRESSING ANY THING BUT MODE. Now, *as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me, in this opinion*, it will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of the lexicons." (P. 79.) Here, Mr. Carson clearly admits, that all lexicographers and commentators are against the *main* position of the immersionists, which is this, the word *baptize* means always to *dip*.

Origen, who flourished in the third century, and was himself a Greek, and the Greek language was his mother tongue, who is of greater authority than many lexicons, uses the following language: "How came you to think that Elias, when he should come, would baptize, who did not, in Ahab's time, baptize the wood upon the altar, which was to be washed before it was burnt, by the Lord's appearing in fire? But he ordered the priests to do that; not once only, but says, Do it the second time; and they did it the second time: and, Do it the third time; and they did it the third time. He, therefore, that did not himself baptize then, but assigned that work to others, how was he likely to baptize, when he, according to Malachi's

prophecy, should come." (Wall's Hist. of Inf Bap., vol. ii., p. 332.)

By turning to 1 Kings, xviii, 33, we can see how that baptism was performed: "And he put the wood in order, and cut the bullock in pieces, and laid him on the wood, and said, Fill four barrels with water and POUR it on the burnt sacrifice, and on the wood." Origen says the wood upon the altar was baptized. How? By *pouring* several barrels of water upon it. If the altar could be baptized by pouring water upon it, so could a person.

We have quoted from some of the most eminent lexicographers the world ever produced, and not *one* of them gives immersion as the only meaning of baptizo. But some of them give immersion as its secondary meaning—Buck, Cole, Wahl, Walker, and others. But after all, the Bible is the best lexicon—those divinely inspired men who wrote it, the best of lexicographers, for they were taught by the Holy Spirit all things. An appeal to it, which is the highest authority, must settle this mooted question in the minds of all who are truly inquiring after truth. The opinion of authors, however distinguished and learned, cannot be

brought to overthrow the Scriptures given by divine inspiration. The sense in which the Scriptures use the word *baptize* will be the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER II.

The sense in which the Scriptures use the word baptize.

But to the Scriptures: by this standard we are willing to stand, or fall. The first place we will adduce is the following: "And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: (βεβαμμενον αἵματι, baptized with blood,) and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he

treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of almighty God," Rev. xix, 11–15

It will be remembered the Greek text is the standard of appeal; for the apostles wrote in Greek. The Savior is here spoken of. He is represented as coming with the armies of heaven; out of his mouth proceedeth a sharp sword, with which he should smite the nations. The figure is a military one. The Savior is represented as a military chieftain, coming from the conquest of his enemies, with his garments stained with blood. How does a successful warrior in the field of battle get blood on his garments? All must admit his garments are *sprinkled* with blood. The case before us is a clear one of aspersion. The blood flying out from the wounds made by the "sharp sword" in "smiting the nations," is called by John, writing under the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit, a BAPTISM. The prophet Isaiah throws light on this subject, and explains how this baptism was performed: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah? this that is glorious in his apparel, traveling in the greatness of his strength? I that speak in righteousness,

mighty to save. Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the wine-fat? I have trodden the wine-press alone; and of the people there was none with me: for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury, and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment," Isa. lxiii, 1–3. What the revelator calls "his vesture baptized with blood," the prophet calls "*sprinkled;*" therefore, the Scriptures in the above places make *baptizing* and sprinkling to be synonymous.

Origen, in quoting this passage, (Rev. xix, 13,) substitutes the word *rantizo (sprinkle)* for bapto, though, in other respects, he quotes it verbatim. The old Peshito Syraic version translates it thus: (Latin translation by Schaaf and Leusden:) *aspersa* (*sprinkle*). The Vulgate by Jerome, renders it *aspersa* (*sprinkle*). The Ethiopic renders it *sprinkle.* The French renders it *teinte* (*stained*). The German translation by Luther, is the same, "Und war angethan mit einem Kleide, das mit Blut besprenget war." —He was clothed with a garment that was besprinkled with blood.

Here are three ancient translations: the Syriac, the Vulgate, and Ethiopic, also the French and German, together with Origen, a native Greek, giving *sprinkle* as the meaning of bebammanon, a derivative of bapto.

We will now call your attention to Dan. iv, 33: "The same hour was the thing fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar: and he was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was (εβαφη, baptized) wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws." The case of this monarch was this: for his sins the Lord deprived him of his senses, and he was driven from the society of men, and did eat grass as the ox, and at night he slept on the cold ground, as the beast of the forest, having no other covering than a clouded canopy, or a starry-decked heaven; and the dew gently falling upon him during the night, is called a *baptism.* The falling of dew is the most gentle form of sprinkling, yet it is called a *baptism!* Baptized with the dew from heaven. This is a clear case of sprinkling: immersion is perfectly out of the question. But the dew gently falling upon him, by the

prophet is called a baptism. Now, what becomes of the position of the Baptist, that bapto and baptizo always mean immersion, and nothing else?

Again: "As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall (bapsei apo, baptize from) dip them, and the living bird, in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water. And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field," Lev. xiv, 6, 7. Thus the Septuagint translates this passage. Was the *living bird*, *cedar-wood*, *scarlet*, *and hyssop*, *all immersed* in the blood of one bird?

Again, in Heb. ix, 10: "Which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, (διαφοροις βαπτισμοις, divers, various, or different baptisms,) and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." "Which stood:" the Jewish ritual, or mode of purification. The different baptisms are distinguished from the "carnal ordinances:" they had reference to the purification of the flesh,

which are fully explained in Leviticus, fifteenth chapter. The apostle goes on, in the thirteenth and fourteenth verses, and explains some of those baptisms referred to: "For, if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer, SPRINKLING the unclean, sanctifieth, to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works, to serve the living God." The apostle refers to Num. xix, 9, 13: "And a man that is clean, shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up without the camp, in a clean place, and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel, for a water of separation, it is purification for sin. * * * Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Israel; because the water of separation was not *sprinkled* upon him." Again, in Heb. ix, 19th to 21st verse, inclusive: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves and goats, with water and

scarlet wool and hyssop, and SPRINKLED both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover, he SPRINKLED likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry." Moses, as he baptized, or sprinkled the people, used the following sacramental words: namely, "*This is the blood* of the testament which God hath *enjoined unto you.*" Paul says, "Which was a figure for the time then present." Again: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things." How beautifully this represents Christian baptism, which is to be performed using the following sacramental words: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." The Jewish dispensation was a "figure" and a "shadow of good things to come."

In the whole administration of the Jewish economy, whenever it required an administrator and a subject, the baptism, or rite of purification was always and invariably done by sprinkling. "Wherefore," says Paul, "the law was our schoolmaster, to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith." And as

sprinkling was invariably practiced in that dispensation, sprinkling must now be the mode of baptism. Paul, when he used the words "divers *washings*, or *baptisms*," must have considered the appropriate and correct translation of βαπτισμος, when used in a theological, or sacramental sense, to be *sprinkling*.

That dispensation, as a schoolmaster, was to lead us to Christ. The blood of the sacrifices was only available, as it pointed to, or was a type of the blood of Christ. Paul says, "Without shedding of blood, is no remission." The blood of Christ is to be applied to the soul, or spiritual man by the Holy Ghost. The water of baptism is to be applied to the body, or the material man, which is a representation of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, or the purification of the heart.

As soul and body are both the subjects of the saving power of the Gospel, it is intended there should be something appropriate in religion for both. The soul is to be baptized with the blood of Christ, by the Holy Ghost; the body is to be baptized with water, by a proper administrator. This is beautifully expressed by Paul, when he says, "Having our hearts

sprinkled *(baptized)* from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed *(baptized)* with pure water."

The word washed is from λουω, which does not mean immersion; but to *wash by applying the water to the body.* If the above place have reference to baptism, where it says, "and our bodies washed with pure water," in which all immersionists agree, then it decides the whole controversy on the mode of baptism in favor of sprinkling. How beautifully this fulfills the prophecy of Ezek. xxxvi, 25, 26: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean, from all your filthiness and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." This being the case, how forcibly it strikes the mind, that sprinkling was intended by the great Head of the Church to be practiced as the correct mode of baptism! Ninth verse: "Which was a figure (παραβολη, *type*, or *emblem*) for the time then present." If the tabernacle and its services, embracing the rites and ceremonies of that dispensation, were only typical, or emblematical of the Gospel dispensation, it is certain, then, that immer-

sion cannot be the mode of baptism the Scriptures intended to teach.

Again: "Then came together unto him the Pharisees, and certain of the Scribes, which came from Jerusalem. And when they saw some of his disciples eat bread with defiled (that is to say, with unwashen) hands, they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders. And when they come from the market, except they wash, (βαπτισωνται, *baptize)* they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing (βαπτισμους, *baptisms)* of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and tables," Mark vii, 1–4. It was a custom among the Jews to wash their hands before eating; and especially when they came from the market. So particular were they, except they washed *(baptized)* they ate not. Here is a clear case, where the water is only applied to a part of the body, and *it is called* a baptism. The Savior was invited to dine with a Pharisee, and without washing his hands, "he went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled, that he had not first washed (εβαπτισθη,

baptized) himself before dinner," Luke xi, 38. Did the Pharisee marvel because he had not first immersed himself? Verily, no! He marveled that he had not first washed his hands, according to the Jewish tradition.

"Of tables, beds, couches, και κλινων: It is likely it means no more than the *forms*, or *seats*, on which they sat to eat. A bed or couch was defiled if any unclean person sat, or leaned on it—a man with an issue—a leper—a woman with child, &c. As the word βαπτισμους, baptisms, is applied to all of them, and as it is contended that this word and the verb whence it is derived, signify *dipping*, or immersion *alone*, its use in the above case *refutes that opinion*, and shows that it was used not only to express *dipping*, or immersion, but also *sprinkling* and washing." (Clarke's Com.)

The Baptism of the Holy Ghost. John says, "I indeed baptize you with water, * * * but he that cometh after me * * * shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," Matt. iii, 11. The Savior says, "For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall baptize

with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence," Acts i, 5. It will be observed, that, in the above quotations, water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Ghost are connected. When the action of two different things is expressed by *one* word, if we can find out the *action*, or modus operandi of *one*, this, in the absence of positive testimony, must be the best evidence that can be adduced to ascertain the action of the other. We have the baptism of water and that of the Holy Ghost set forth here by one word, namely, "*baptize*." If we can ascertain the manner of performing the baptism of the Holy Ghost, we then clearly demonstrate the mode of water baptism—at least John's. This prophecy was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. Acts ii: "And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, and it (the sound) filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak

with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. Peter standing up with the eleven, and said, But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, (ii, 28, 32;) And it shall come to pass in the last days (saith God) I will pour out of my Spirit on all flesh: * * * And on my servants and handmaidens, I will pour out, in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy." Here we see the baptism of the Holy Ghost was clearly performed by *pouring*. And to put it beyond a doubt, Peter, rehearsing the matter, says, "*He hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear.*" Again: speaking of the transaction which took place at the house of Cornelius: "And, as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell* on them, as on us at the beginning, (day of Pentecost.) Then remembered I the words of the Lord, how that he said, John, indeed, baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Query: How did the falling of the Holy Ghost upon Cornelius and his friends, remind Peter of the baptism of John, if John baptized by immersion? Just as a few drops of rain falling upon one's head, would remind

him of having fallen into a river, or a millpond, sometime of his life!

The baptism of the Holy Spirit had the appearance of cloven tongues of fire, which sat upon them. This was the visible *sign*, or *emblem* of the Holy Ghost. It was not a large flame of fire, that they might have been plunged or immersed in it; but it sat upon them, just as we pour water *upon* a person to baptize him. It was in the form of a tongue, to represent that the *gift of tongues* was connected with the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

We have *four* forms of expression, showing the mode of baptism of the Spirit: namely, "*pour out*," "*fell on them*," "*shed forth*," and "*come upon*." This fixes the mode of the baptism of the Holy Ghost beyond a doubt.

This is the highest baptism, *and the only real baptism*. For instance, Paul says, "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is *that* circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart in the *spirit*, and not in the letter." Circumcision in the flesh was not the *real* circumcision; but was only to personify, or represent it. So

water baptism is *not the real* baptism, but is to represent it. St. Paul says, "One Lord, one faith, *one* baptism," which is that of the Spirit.

Then, from the foregoing premises, the baptism of the Holy Ghost is clearly defined to be a *pouring;* and if water baptism is an inferior one, and is only to represent it in its primary design, it is evident it should be after the same manner.

If the baptism of the Holy Ghost is the *real* baptism, and water baptism is only a figure to represent the reality, then the figure, to be a good one, should *resemble* the thing represented as nearly as possible; for instance, if we would make the figure of a man, we must make it as nearly in the form of a man as possible, and not in the form of an ox, or a horse. So to make water baptism a *good* figure to represent the baptism of the Holy Ghost, it must be by *pouring out, falling on, shedding forth,* or *coming upon,* the candidate; and this is any thing but immersion.

Our Baptist brethren, even in the above plain case of pouring, endeavor to make out immersion. "And suddenly there came a *sound* from heaven as a rushing mighty wind, and

it filled all the house where they were sitting." They say, "If the house were filled where they were sitting, they must have been immersed." What filled the house? Why, the sound. The pronoun "*it*" has for its antecedent "*sound.*" Then the sound filled the house, and if they were immersed, of course it was in the sound. But the Savior says, "Not many days hence, ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost," *not in sound!*

In a public debate which the writer had with a distinguished immersionist, he tried to make out immersion in the above case in a different manner. He assumed, 1. They were in the temple, and quoted Haggai ii, 7: "And I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts." He then assumed, 2. The "glory" with which the second temple was to be filled, was the baptism of the Holy Ghost, on the day of Pentecost.

Doubtless, the place where they were all with one accord, was an upper room, where the disciples abode, when they all "continued with one accord in prayer and supplication,

with the women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, and his brethren. And in those days, Peter stood up in the midst of the disciples," &c., Acts i, 13, 14. This could not be in the temple, for every part of it was consecrated to religious purposes; but it was an "upper room," where they "abode," cooked, ate, and slept.

In reference to the second position, it is such a wide stretch of imagination, that it scarcely requires a serious refutation; but we will only notice what the prophet says, "The *glory* of this latter house shall be greater than the former." If the glory spoken of were the same as the baptism of the Holy Ghost, then the Holy Ghost was, or is to be, greater at one time than what he was at another!

Again: "He that washeth himself (βαπτιζόμενος, is baptized) after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washing," Ecc. (Apoc.) xxxiv, 25. By reference to the nineteenth chapter of Numbers, we can tell to a certainty how that baptism was performed: "Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut off from Is-

rael: because the water of separation was not *sprinkled* upon him."

Dr. Thomas Scott, the commentator, admitted by all to be a learned man, quotes Leighton as saying, "It *(baptizo)* is taken more largely for any kind of washing, rinsing, or cleansing, even where there is no dipping at all," then remarks, "The word was adopted from the Greek authors, and a sense put upon it by the inspired writers, according to the style of Scripture, to signify the use of water in the sacrament of baptism, and in many things of a spiritual nature, which stood related to it. Some, indeed, contend zealously that *baptism* always signifies *immersion;* but the use of the words *baptize* and *baptism* in the New Testament, cannot accord with this exclusive interpretation."

Dr. Dwight, who is admitted to have been one of the most learned men in the United States, says, "I have examined almost one hundred instances in which the word *baptizo* and its derivatives are used in the New Testament, and four in the Septuagint; and these, so far as I have observed, being all the instances contained in both. By this examin-

ation, it is, to my apprehension, evident that the following things are true: that the primary meaning of these terms is cleansing; the effect not the mode of washing: that the mode is usually referred to *incidentally*, whenever these words are mentioned, and that this is always the case wherever the ordinance of baptism is mentioned, and a reference made, at the same time, to the mode of administration: that these words, although often capable of denoting any mode of washing, whether by affusion, sprinkling, or immersion, (since cleansing was familiarly accomplished by the Jews in all these ways,) yet, in many instances, cannot, without obvious impropriety, be made to signify immersion, and in others cannot signify it at all." (Theology, vol. v, p. 331.)

We now have completely demolished the main position taken by the Baptists, on which they principally rest their cause: namely, "that bapto and baptizo, with their derivatives, always mean immersion."

We now affirm, that the word "*baptize*," when used in a sacramental, or theological sense, *never means immersion*, but *pouring* and *sprinkling*.

It is important for a correct understanding of the Scriptures, and especially in reference to the controversy on baptism, to ascertain whether words are used in their *classic*, or *theological* sense: that is, not how the heathen Greek writers used them, but in what sense did the Savior and his apostles employ them. In no place in the Scriptures, by any fair construction of the passage, is the word *baptize* used in the sense of immersing the body in water, but, as has already been shown, it is used to denote pouring and sprinkling.

We will now examine this position. Man has an immortal soul, an undying principle, which is called ψυχη, *breath*. Well, if we are to interpret the Scriptures after the manner of the Baptist, which is to use words only in their *classic* sense, we may then say, man has nothing more than his *breath!*

Hear what the great Professor Stuart says: "New Testament usage of the word, in cases not relevant to this rite, clearly does not entitle you (immersionists) to such a conclusion with any confidence. If you say, 'the classical usage of the word abundantly justifies the construction I put upon it,' my reply is, that clas-

sical usage can never be very certain in respect to the meaning of a word in the New Testament. Who does not know that a multitude of Greek words here receive their coloring and particular meaning from the Hebrew, and not from the Greek classics? Does *Theos*, (God,) *ouranos*, (heaven,) *sarx*, (flesh,) *pistis*, (faith,) *dikaiosune*, (righteousness,) and other words, almost without number, exhibit meanings which conform to the Greek classics, or which, in general, can be illustrated by them? Not at all. Then, how can you be over-confident in the application of the classical meaning of baptizo, where the word is employed in relation to a rite that is purely Christian? *Such a confidence is indeed common, but it is not the more rational, nor the more becoming, on that account.*"

The word used in the New Testament for spirit, or ghost is πνευμα, which is derived from πνεω, to blow. Its classic use is *wind, gale, blast, air, vapor.* Should a classical meaning be contended for, then the phrase, "yielded up the ghost," would be, yielded up the *wind;* "blessed are the poor in spirit," *blessed are the poor in wind;* "the spirit indeed is will-

ing," *the wind indeed is willing;* "neither angel nor spirit," *neither angel nor wind;* "to the spirits of just men made perfect," *to the winds of just men made perfect;* "he cast out the spirits," *he cast out the winds.*

Again: we believe in the resurrection of the dead. Paul, when at Athens, "preached unto them Jesus and the resurrection," (*την αιαστασιν, standing up.*) Here, then, according to our Baptist brethren, Paul did not preach the resurrection of the dead, but only *a standing up of the people.* This would suit the Sadducees. This shows how important it is to ascertain whether a word is used in a *classic*, or a *theological* sense. It is readily admitted some words retain, in theology, their classic meaning, but this could not be the case with all words; for, of many of the doctrines of the Gospel, and especially the resurrection of the dead, the heathens had no idea, and could not have used a word to express it. A case in point: Paul says, "Is not to eat the Lord's supper," (*δειπνον, a feast.*) Yet we all think we celebrate the Lord's supper in a correct manner by taking a *little crum* of bread and a *sip* of wine.

The mode of interpretation adopted by our opponents would destroy the doctrine of the *immortality* of the soul, the *resurrection* of the dead, and, to cap the climax, would have us to partake of a full meal, or feast, in order to celebrate the Lord's supper.

Dr. Owen, one of the greatest and most learned men, says, "*Baptizo* signifies to *wash*, as instances out of all authors may be given." Again: "No one place can be given in the Scriptures wherein *baptizo* doth necessarily signify either *to dip*, or *plunge*." Again: "In this sense, as it expresseth baptism, it denotes *to wash* only, and not *to dip* at all; for so it is expounded, Tit. iii, 5," &c. Again: "Wherefore, in this sense, as the word is applied unto the ordinance, the sense of dipping is utterly excluded." (Owen's Works, vol. xxi, p. 557.)

Our opponents further say, in their zeal and determination to make out immersion, "Though the Greek language is exuberant, and abounds with the richness of its expression, yet there is not another word in the whole language to convey the idea of *immersion* but bapto and baptizo, and the Savior thus selected

the only word in the language that means *immersion;* therefore, the mode of baptism must be by immersion." This is not true. There are several words in the Greek which convey the idea of *dipping*, *immersing*, and *plunging:* namely, καταποντιζω, καταβαπτω, εμβαπτω, εμβαπτιζω, δυνω, παραδνω, εναποκλυω, συγκαλυπτω.

CHAPTER III.

John's baptism.

John *baptized in Jordan.* "If so," say our opponents, "he must have immersed the people." This would be a good conclusion, if he could not have baptized at a river in any other manner. The Scripture says, he baptized "in the wilderness," in "Bethabara, beyond Jordan," "in Jordan," and "at Enon." John was a minister of the wilderness, personified by the prophet Isaiah: "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord," Isa. xl, 3.

Three of those places named, doubtless, have reference to the same district of country, where John exercised his office and ministry,

which was the "wilderness of Judea," which extended as far as the river Jordan, from whence he obtained his supplies of water. He did not immerse the people in Jordan, for, "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing," John i. 28. Again: "But he escaped out of their hand, and went away again beyond Jordan into the place where John at first baptized, and there abode, and many resorted unto him," John x, 40. Ask an immersionist where John first baptized? His answer will be, "*in Jordan.*" Well, what do you mean by the phrase "in Jordan?" In the water, and under its surface. Well, did Christ go there and take up his abode!

"Bethabara, beyond Jordan." Dr. Clarke thinks it should be Bethany, which was on the other side of Jordan, in the tribe of Reuben. Its meaning is, "*house of passage*," and is thought to be at the place where the Israelites passed the river Jordan under Joshua. If the correct reading is "Bethabara," *house of passage*, instead of Bethany, which was beyond Jordan, in the tribe of Reuben, then John's baptism was a *house* baptism: this, then,

strongly implies the idea that he sprinkled the people, or baptized them *with* water.

The baptism of John and that of Christ, were viewed by the people as a system of purification, after the manner of the Jews: "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews, about *purifying*. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same *baptizeth*, and all men come to him," John iii, 25, 26. There was a controversy between some of John's followers and the Jews about the baptism of John and that of Christ. The Jews told John's disciples, "Behold the same (Christ) baptizeth, and all men come to him." And this was a *question about purifying*. Well, what was the manner of the Jewish mode of purification? *Sprinkling;* therefore, the baptism of John and of Christ was by *sprinkling*, or the Jews would not have considered it a mode of purification.

It is very probable John occasionally exercised his ministry at the brink of the water of Jordan, when the weather was pleasant; and this being the case, it would be proper to say,

he baptized "*in Jordan:*" for instance, Joshua iii, 8, "And thou shalt command the priests that bear the ark of the covenant, saying, when ye are come to the *brink* of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still in Jordan." If it were proper to say the priests were *standing still in Jordan*, though only at the brink of the water, it would be correct to say, John baptized "in Jordan," though he was only at the edge of the water. There might have been a strip of country on either side of Jordan, or its *valley*, called Jordan, and thus John might have baptized "in Jordan," or the valley, or country of Jordan: just as we speak of going out into the *Maumee;* but we do not mean into the water, but only into the Maumee country, or valley; therefore, John was called, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness."

We suppose John did not baptize by immersion, from the consideration of the *literal and physical impossibility.* John could not have immersed the millions who came to his baptism! The number he baptized would be difficult to tell precisely, but we think we can come sufficiently near to show it would be impossible for him to immerse them. There,

doubtless, were five millions of inhabitants in Judea at that time. In the days of David there were one million three hundred thousand "valiant men that drew the sword," besides the tribes of Levi and Benjamin. If we reckon only five for every warrior—this would embrace those under twenty years old, with the aged and infirm, with women and children—we would have six millions and a half. Josephus gives us the following account of the population of Palestine in A. D. 66, forty years after the time John entered on his ministry, (see Wars, b. II, chap. xiv, sec. 3:) "Whilst Cestius Gallus was president of the province of Syria, nobody durst so much as send an embassage to him against Florus; but when he was come to Jerusalem, upon the approach of the feast of unleavened bread, the people came about him, not fewer than *three* millions: these besought him to commiserate the calamities of their nation, and cried out upon Florus as the bane of their nation." Josephus further says, *one* million and one hundred thousand perished in the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70. At this time the Jews were greatly reduced in number by the wars they were

engaged in with the Romans, and among themselves; so at the time of John there could not have been less than five millions.

The next item that will engage our attention, will be the *number baptized:* "Then went out to him Jerusalem, and *all Judea*, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him, in Jordan, confessing their sins," Matt. iii, 5, 6. "And there went out unto him, *all* the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of John," Mark i, 5. "Now, when *all* the *people* were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized," Luke iii, 21. We will not contend that every man, woman, and child were baptized; but from the above language, it must mean a large majority of the whole: "*Jerusalem*," "*all Judea*," "*all the land of Judea*," "*all the regions round about Jordan*," "all the people." This would not be correct, if a less number than a majority were baptized. For instance, should it be said of a Baptist clergyman, that he visited Wooster and immersed all Wooster, and all Wayne county, and all the regions round about Wayne county, it would not be correct if a less

number than a majority only were immersed. Then John must have baptized at least *three millions*.

The next inquiry will be, the time of John's ministry. This we can ascertain pretty clearly. We believe it lasted something near *eight months*. John was thirty years old when he entered on his public ministry, which was the age required by the law, for a priest to enter on the public functions of his office. "From thirty years old and upward, even until fifty years old, all that enter into the host, to do the work in the tabernacle of the congregation," Num. iv, 3. "Now in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, * * * the word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness," Luke iii, 1, 2. This was A. D. 26, which would make John thirty years old. "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized. * * * And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age," Luke iii, 21, 23. At the time of Christ's baptism, John's ministry had lasted six months; for he was that much older than the Savior. The

very next circumstance, as recorded by the evangelists, after the baptism of Christ was, Christ's forty days and nights temptation of the devil in the wilderness. The next circumstance after the expiration of forty days, was the imprisonment of John that ended his public ministry. Put forty days to six months, and we will have between seven and eight months. Was it possible that John could have immersed *three millions* in eight months!

Our opponents being pressed with this view of the subject, try to lengthen out the time of his ministry. Some contend for twelve months—others for eighteen.

Admit, we grant for a moment all they contend for, which is eighteen months, and we will suppose John stepped into the water up to his waist, the moment he entered on his public ministry, and stood there *day* and *night*, *winter* and *summer*, for twenty-four hours in each day—allowing him no time to eat, drink, sleep, or preach—and baptized one for every minute, how many could he have baptized? Only seven hundred and eighty-eight thousand and four hundred—*a little over three-fourths of a million.*

To suppose he baptized less than one million, is not what our opponents contend for; and indeed to do so, would be a perfect disregard of the Scripture and facts in the case. So we see to put it down to the smallest possible number, and grant all they contend for as to time, John could not have baptized by immersion.

But admitting he baptized three millions, and we believe he did, at least that number; and we will suppose his ministry lasted only eight months, which was about the correct time; and we will further suppose he stood in the water up to his waist, and baptized for six hours every day—more he could not do without a continued miracle to sustain him, and it will be recollected, "John did no miracles"—how many must he have baptized every minute? He must have baptized *thirty-four* every minute! This shows it could not have been done by immersion. But he could have baptized the people by sprinkling. "Moses sprinkled all the people," Heb. ix, 19. (See Exodus xxiv.) But what was their number? "All those that were numbered of the camps throughout their hosts, were six hundred thou-

sand and three thousand and five hundred and fifty," Num. ii, 32. (See Dr. Clarke's Commentary on this chapter.) Suppose there were five to each warrior, including young and old men, women and children; then we would have above *three millions*. The Scriptures represent, that Moses *sprinkled* all of them forthwith. This was done with "scarlet wool and hyssop;" and as John's baptism was a Jewish purification, or something similar to it, John must have sprinkled the people after the manner of Moses.

Our immersion brethren say, "John baptized at Enon, because there was 'much water;' therefore, he immersed the people." This is the last place where he exercised his ministry. The first place was "beyond Jordan," which, as we have already seen, embraced that district of country called the "wilderness of Judea," and extended as far as Jordan, from whence he obtained his supplies of water. This place was emphatically called "*beyond Jordan.*" The second and last place was at Enon, near Salem.

"*Much water*," πολλα ὕδατα, *many* waters. This may refer to small as well as large

streams. "The Baptists, however, have magnified Enon, which signifies the *fountain of On*, into a place of 'many and great waters.' Unfortunately, however, no such powerful fountain, sending out many streams of water fit for plunging multitudes into, has ever been found by travelers, although the country has been often visited; and certainly if its streams had been of the copious and remarkable character assigned to them, they could not have vanished. It rather appears, however, that the 'much water,' or 'many waters' in the text, refers rather to the whole tract of country, than to the fountain of On itself, because it appears to be given by the evangelist as the reason why Jesus and his disciples came into the same neighborhood to baptize. Different baptisms were administered, and, therefore, in different places. The baptism administered by Jesus at this time was of multitudes. This appears from the remark of one of John's disciples to his master: 'He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same baptizeth, and all men *come to him*.' The place, or places, too, where Jesus baptized, although in the same district, could

not be very near, since John's disciple mentions the multitudes who came to be baptized by Jesus, or rather by his disciples, as a piece of information; and thus we find a reason for the mention of much water, or many waters, with reference to the district of country itself, and not to the single fountain of On. The tract probably had many fountains in it, which, as being a peculiarity in a country not so distinguished, would lead to the use of the expression, 'much water,' although not one of those fountains, or wells might be sufficient to allow of the plunging of numbers of people, and probably was not. Indeed, if the disciples of Jesus baptized by immersion, the immersionists are much more concerned to discover 'much water,' 'many waters,' 'large and deep streams,' somewhere else in the district than at Enon; because it is plain from the narrative, that the number of candidates for John's baptism had greatly fallen off at that time." (Watson.)

"Salem was at least fifty miles north, up the river Jordan from the place where John had begun to baptize. Enon, near it, was either a natural *spring*, an artificial reservoir, or a cavernous temple of the sun, prepared by

the Canaanites, the ancient idolatrous inhabitants of the land. The eastern versions, that is, the Syriac, Ethiopic, Persiac, and Arabic, of the Gospel of John, as well as the Hebrew and Chaldean Ain-yon, Gnain-yon, suggest these opinions, and it is difficult to say which is the precise meaning of the evangelist's word Enon, and it is not certain whether the plain meaning be, John was baptizing at the *Dove-spring* near Salem, or, John was baptizing at the *Sun fountain* near Salem. * * * * Springs issuing from the fissures of rocks, gurgling through the chinks as waters out of bottles, falling from crag to crag, murmuring from bed to basin, and from basin to bed, fretting along the ragged sides of a rocky cavern, would form what the Jews called a *Dove-water*, or, if it flowed from a natural spring, in their figurative style, a *Dove's-eye.*" (Robinson's Hist. of Baptism, pp. 27 and 30.) This author is a Baptist, and he expressly says, page 29, "The spring where John baptized was called the *Dove's-eye.*" Here, then, the deep and large streams, the "much water" of the Baptists, at Enon, is, according to their own showing, the spring of the *Dove's-eye!*

Hear what Professor Stuart says on this point: "Now John was baptizing in (or *at*) Enon, near Salem, *hoti hudata polla en ekei*, for there was MUCH WATER there; or, (more literally,) there were MANY WATERS there. The question is, whether John baptized at Enon, near Salem, because the waters there were abundant and deep, so as to afford convenient means of immersion, or whether the writer meant merely to say that John made choice of Enon, because there was an abundant supply of water there for the accommodation of those who visited him for the sake of being baptized, and hearing the powerful addresses he made to the Jews. The former statement makes the *much waters*, or *many waters*, necessary, or, at least, convenient and desirable, for the purposes of the baptismal rite—the latter for supplying the wants of the multitudes who attended the preaching of John. It has always seemed to me a very singular mode of expression, if the sacred writer meant to designate the former idea, to say *hoti hudata polla en ekei*. Why not say, because the water was deep, or abundant, simply? A sin gle brook, of very small capacity, but a living

stream, might, with scooping out a small place in the sand, answer most abundantly all the purposes of baptism, in case it were performed by immersion, and answer them just as well as *many waters* could do. But, on the other hand, a single brook would not suffice for the accommodation of the great multitudes who flocked to John. The sacred writers tell us that 'there went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the regions of Jordan,' Matt. iii, 5; and that they were baptized of him. Of course, there must have been a great multitude of people. Nothing could be more natural than for John to choose a place that was watered by many streams, where all could be accommodated. The circumstances of the case, then, would seem to favor the interpretation which refers the mention of the *many waters* to the wants of the people who flocked to hear John." (Stuart on the Mode of Baptism, pp. 37, 38.)

John's baptism was not Christian baptism, (see Acts xix, 1–7,) but was a kind of a Jewish purification. When he says, "I indeed baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost," he means "I

indeed *purify* you with water, but he shall *purify* you with the Holy Ghost."

CHAPTER IV.

Christ's baptism.

THIS is brought forward by the immersionists as a case of baptism by immersion. Matthew says, Christ came (επι) to Jordan; and Mark says, he was "baptized in Jordan." John baptized him; but with what baptism was he baptized? It could not have been John's baptism, for that was a *baptism unto repentance*. Did He who knew no sin, in whose mouth no guile was found, *repent?* Repentance is founded in sin, and none but a sinner can repent. Some say, "Christ's baptism was the beginning of the Christian baptism;' but they forget that the Christian baptism was not instituted, or commanded until above three years after Christ was baptized, when he commanded his disciples to "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Besides, Christ would then have been baptized in his Father's name, and in his *own* name, and in

the name of the Holy Ghost, which, to say the least, would be absurd.

Again: other immersionists say, "Christ's baptism was to set us an example, and we must follow him just as he set the example." But, says the evangelist, "When all the people were baptized, it came to pass Jesus, also, being baptized," &c., Luke iii, 21. A singular manner of setting an example, to wait until *all* the people were baptized. Do the Baptists intend to be understood that we are to follow the example of Christ, and wait until all the people are baptized? Then, no one would be baptized; for all would be waiting until the rest were baptized; or, do they wish us to follow his example, and wait until we are thirty years of age, and then have it done by a *Jewish priest* in the river Jordan? If so, it then would be done by sprinkling with a bunch of hyssop.

It is evident he was not baptized with John's baptism. Well, with what kind of baptism was he baptized? *It was a priestly washing, or consecration.* He was inducted into his priestly office by John. This was required by the law: "And this is the thing that thou

shalt do unto them to *hallow* them, to minister unto me in the priest's office. * * * And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash (baptize) them with water," Ex. xxix, 1, 4. It was this priestly washing, or consecration, that John performed on Christ, as we may learn from what the Savior says: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee *to* Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized (or purified) of thee, and comest thou to me? (to be purified.) And Jesus answering said unto him, suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him," Matt. iii, 13–15. "Fulfill all righteousness:" says Dr. Clarke, "*Every righteous ordinance.*" He submitted to circumcision, and now requires baptism. But, He says, "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." On his part, 1. The righteousness of God. 2. The righteousness of the law. On the part of John, 1. The righteousness of faith. 2. The righteousness of the saints.

Behold the Savior teaching in the temple.

"The chief priests and the elders of the people said unto him, by what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority? And he answered and said unto them, I will ask you one thing, The baptism of John, whence was it?" They asked the Savior for his authority to teach in the temple. It was no part of his design to equivocate, but to give a forcible answer. And what was it? John's baptism. How did John's baptism give him authority to teach in the temple? By consecrating him a high priest. Paul says, "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices: wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer," Heb. viii, 3. The high priests were ordained by being taken to the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and there washed with water and anointed with oil. Christ was thus ordained by John on the banks of the Jordan, when he baptized him; and by the Holy Spirit: "Thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows:" that is, he was anointed above all the high priests that preceded him.

An objection is urged against this view of

the subject, which is this: "He was a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and not after that of Aaron." Paul says, "Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, king of righteousness, and after that king of Salem, which is, king of peace; without father or mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God," Heb. vii. In the above respect, he was after the order of Melchisedec; without father or mother; that is, he did not descend from any line of priests, as did Aaron and his sons. He sprang from the tribe of Judah, "of which no man gave any attendance at the altar." As we have already seen, the Jewish dispensation was a *type*, or *emblem* of the Gospel. They had their high priest: we have, also, a "high priest of our profession, Christ Jesus;" "a minister of the sanctuary, and the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man." Though a priest after the order of Melchisedec, he was "called of God, as was Aaron." Paul says, "Now, I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision, for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." We

see the connection from Melchisedec down through Aaron to Christ. Levi paid tithes to Melchisedec, being in the loins of Abraham, who met him returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him. The priesthood of Levi, or Aaron, was a type of that of Christ, the law requiring, at the age of thirty years, at the door of the tabernacle, a priestly washing, or consecration. This *washing*, or *baptism*, was a *sprinkling*, as we learn from Numbers viii: "Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them: and this shalt thou do to cleanse them, *sprinkle* water of purification upon them."

Our opponents say, "'And when Jesus was baptized, he went up straightway out of the water;' therefore, he was immersed." It reads in the original, ανεβη ευθυς απο του ὑδατος: *he ascended straightway from the water.* To show this to be the literal rendering of the Greek, the primary meaning of απο is *from*, and not "out of." It is used five hundred and ninety-two times in the New Testament, three hundred and thirty-six times it is translated *from*, one hundred and fourteen times *of*, and only forty-eight times *out of*. This shows its

primary meaning to be *from*. Well, if we had its primary meaning in our common translation, it would read thus: "He went up straightway *from* the water." The meaning of the word ανεβη is *to climb, to ascend, to scale*. This is the same word, mood, tense, and person, where it speaks of Zaccheus: "And he ran before, and (ανεβη) *climbed* up into a sycamore tree to see him," Luke xix, 3. Again: he (ανεβη) went up into a mountain, Matt. v, 1. Its literal meaning is, he ascended the banks of the Jordan. The immersionists would convey the idea, "he arose out of the watery grave of immersion:" that is, from the depth John had plunged him. This would have been the action of John, and not of the Savior. The administrator of immersion *raises the candidate out of the water himself*. The candidate is passive in his hands. But the action here is ascribed to the Savior, and not to John; therefore, it is unconnected with the immediate action of baptism, and simply means, after he was baptized, "he *immediately*, or *straightway ascended from the water*."

The place where Jesus was baptized is

emphatically said to be "*in Bethabara, beyond Jordan.*" Matthew says, "He came to Jordan to be baptized." Mark says, "He was baptized in Jordan." But John says he was baptized "in Bethabara, beyond Jordan:" "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing. The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, (to be baptized,) and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world! This is he of whom I said, after me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was before me. And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him," John i, 28–32. This whole scene is laid by the evangelist "*in Bethabara, beyond Jordan.*"

The first fact stated is, John was baptizing in Bethabara, beyond Jordan. 2. Here is the place where Jesus came to John to be baptized. 3. In order that Christ might be made manifest to Israel, John was sent to baptize with water. 4. The record which John bare

of him, which was at the time of his baptism, saying, "I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." Now, "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." John, the evangelist, in another place, declares the same fact: "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews, about purifying. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him," John iii, 25, 26. Here it is stated, "He that was with thee beyond Jordan, of whom thou bearest witness." The time that Christ was with John, and the time that John bare "witness," or "record," of Christ, was at the time of his baptizing. The evangelist emphatically says, it was "beyond Jordan." This view of the subject destroys the idea of immersion, from the *supposed fact*

that Christ was baptized in the *stream* of the river of Jordan.

In conclusion of this subject we say, the Savior's baptism was not a baptism by immersion, because the baptism, or priestly washing required by the law, was a *sprinkling*.

CHAPTER V.

The baptism of the eunuch, by Philip, Acts viii.

The baptism of the eunuch is always resorted to with a great deal of confidence by our immersion brethren. This Ethiopian prince was a proselyte Jew—had been to Jerusalem to worship—was reading by the way in his Hebrew or Greek Bible, in the fifty-second and fifty-third chapters of the prophecy of Isaiah, "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter," &c. Philip was walking by the side of his carriage and said unto him, "Understandest thou what thou readest?" He replied, "How can I, except some man shall guide me?" He then invited Philip to sit with him in his chariot. The eunuch inquired of him, "Was the prophet speaking of himself, or some other person?" Then Philip opened his mouth, and began

the same Scripture and preached unto him Jesus.

It is emphatically said, "*The place of the Scripture*," meaning all the prophecy concerning Christ, of which that was a part quoted by the evangelist. Then it was not confined to the fifty-third chapter, but commenced at the thirteenth verse of the fifty-second chapter. It will be remembered, the division of the Bible into chapters and verses was the work of the thirteenth century. From this Scripture Philip preached Jesus, that is, explained the whole plan of redemption, the institutions of the Church, and ordinances of the house of God. Baptism was fully explained; for when they came to some water, the eunuch desired to be baptized. And from what portion of the above "place of the Scripture" did he preach baptism? Doubtless, from the following: "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations;" showing here, the "*sprinkling many nations*" meant baptizing them.

In order to make it clear that this is a correct view of the subject, we will refer to what Peter says: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us," 1 Peter iii, 21

Baptism is, therefore, a "like figure," to rep resent a substance, or something that saves us And what is that? We will let Peter explain himself: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and *sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ*," 1 Peter i, 2. Here, then, the substance is declared to be the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." If baptism is a "like figure" of the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ, then sprinkling must be the mode. This agrees with what Paul says: "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God!" Heb. ix, 13, 14. Again: "We are come" "to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant, and the blood of sprinkling." This, then, clearly shows, the "sprinkling of many nations" means baptizing them.

But our opponents say, "Both Philip and tne eunuch went down *into* the water, and he

baptized him, and they came up out of the water, and of course he immersed him." They further say, the Greek preposition, εἰσ, translated, *into*, used in this case, and the word ἐν, used where it says, "John baptized *in* (ἐν) Jordan," always mean *into*, and nothing else. Is this position true? It certainly is not; therefore, the inference they wish to draw from it is not correct.

Parkhurst (see his Lexicon) gives sixteen different definitions to ἐν. I will quote one portion of Scripture where it is used: "At (ἐν) the right hand of the throne of God," Heb. xii, 2.

Grove (see his Lexicon) gives twenty-three meanings to εἰς, yet our opponents say it has but one.

Donnegan (see his Lexicon) defines it, *to, into.*

Butman's Greek Grammar defines it, *to, into.*

Scapula (see his Lexicon) defines it, "*ad, in,*" *to, into.*

Schrivellius (see his Lexicon) defines it, *ad. in; item, ergo, to, into;* also, *towards.*

These learned authors give *to* as the first, or

primary meaning of εις. We will now quote a few passages of Scripture where it is used. "As it began to dawn (εις) *toward* the first day of the week," Matt. xxviii, 1; "I am not sent but (εις) *unto* the lost sheep of the house of Israel," Matt. xv, 24; "Come (εις) *unto* the marriage," Matt. xxii, 4; "He saith (εις) *unto* him, Wilt thou be made whole," John v, 6; "She goeth (εις) *unto* the grave to weep," John xi, 31; "She fell down (εις) *at* the feet of Jesus," John xi, 32; "Jesus again groaning in himself, cometh (εις) *to* the grave," John xi, 38; "He loved them (εις) *unto* the end," John xiii, 1; "If by any means I might attain (εις) *unto* the resurrection of the dead," Phil. iii, 11; "Use hospitality one (εις) *to* another,' 1 Pet. iv, 9; "Come first (εις) *to* the sepulchre * * * yet went he not in," John xx, 4, 5 "And were all baptized (εις) *unto* Moses,' 1 Cor. x, 2; "John baptized (εις) *unto* repentance," Matt. iii, 11; Saul and his companions "were all fallen (εις) *unto* the earth," Acts xxvi, 14.

Notwithstanding all this array of testimony against our opponents, yet they say, "When (εις) is before water it always brings them *into*

it." To overthrow this position, we will only quote two passages of Scripture. Says our Savior to Peter, in reference to the tribute-money, "Lest we should offend them, go thou (εις) *to* the sea, and cast a hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up," Matt. xvii, 27. Here every person can see, when Peter was commanded to go (εις) *to* the sea, he was not commanded to go into the water. "And when they came (εις) *to* Jordan they cut down wood," 2 Kings vi, 4. Surely they did not go into the water of Jordan to cut down *building timber!*

Mr. Campbell and his followers found their whole system of theology on a different interpretation of εις. For instance, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, (εις,) *for* the remission of sins," Acts ii, 38. When speaking of the mode of baptism it must always mean *into;* but when speaking of the *design* of baptism it means *for*, in the sense to *obtain*. Well, give us this translation: they, both Philip and the eunuch, went *for* the water; that is, to obtain it.

How particular the evangelist is in menuon ing the *water*, and *how* it was procured. This

speciality is not to be observed when speaking of baptism in general. They were traveling on a road that, doubtless, led through a desert country. If the evangelist had simply narrated the case by saying, "He baptized him," infidels might cavil and deny the whole history, and say, "Where was the water? and, if water, whether did he baptize him in the carriage or out of it? and if in the chariot, how did he get the water there?" The evangelist is, therefore, particular in stating that both Philip and the eunuch went down from the chariot to the ground, and from thence to the water, and there he baptized him. The word used here is κατεβησαν, which is from καταβαινω, *to go down, to descend, to disembark.* Then, they *went down, descended,* or *disembarked* from the chariot. The *going down,* spoken of here, is not used in the sense of going down to the water, but simply, *going down from the chariot to the ground;* and from thence, they went *to* or *for* the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and there he baptized him. Immersion can never be made out of this case, when properly understood.

CHAPTER VI.

The baptism of the Israelites.

"MOREOVER, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea," 1 Cor. x, 1, 2.

To be baptized unto Moses is to be *consecrated* by a solemn act—to be devoted to the doctrines and duties of that dispensation of which he was mediator. Likewise, to be baptized into, or rather *unto* Christ, is to be *consecrated* to Christ, as the mediator of the new and everlasting covenant. And if the word "baptize" is to be translated, perhaps the English language does not furnish a more appropriate word than "*consecrate.*"

The next inquiry will be, How was this *consecration*, or baptism, performed?

The Israelites encamped on the banks of the Red Sea—the Egyptians were rushing upon them—the cloud that led them, and was in their front, now passed over them, and stood in their rear. The Lord commanded "Moses to stretch out his hand over the sea; and the

Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea *dry land*, and the waters were divided. * * * And the children of Israel walked on *dry ground* in the midst of the sea, and the waters were a wall on their right hand and their left," Ex. xiv. Their baptism could not be by immersion, for they walked through the sea on *dry ground*. They "*were under the cloud*," and its natural operation would be to *sprinkle*, or *pour out* water, which, doubtless, was the mode of baptism in the above case. We are informed by the Psalmist: "The waters saw thee, O God, the waters saw thee: they were afraid; the depths also were troubled. The clouds poured out water; the skies sent out a sound, thy arrows also went abroad. The voice of thy thunder was in the heaven: the lightnings lightened the world: the earth trembled and shook. Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known. Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron," Ps. lxxvii. This clearly describes the passage of the children of Israel through the Red Sea; and we are informed the *clouds poured* out

water. This baptism is more particularly referred to in the sixty-eighth Psalm: "O God, when thou wentest forth before thy people, when thou didst march through the wilderness. Selah. The earth shook, the heavens dropped at the presence of God: even Sinai itself was moved at the presence of God, the God of Israel. Thou, O God, didst send a *plentiful rain*, whereby thou didst *confirm* thine inheritance when it was weary." This "*plentiful rain*," which the Lord sent on the children of Israel, was to confirm their inheritance unto them. This confirming shower, Paul calls, "baptized unto Moses;" and then He miraculously furnished the Israelites in the wilderness with water and provisions; and to shield them from the scorching rays of an Arabian sun, "He spread a cloud for their covering," Ps. cv, 39.

Our opponents, even in this plain case of sprinkling, try to make out immersion! Some of them say, "The average depth of the Red Sea, where the Israelites crossed, was fifteen hundred feet deep; the water standing on the right and on the left as a wall, and the cloud resting on the top; and thus they were im-

mersed in the cloud and in the sea." This is beautiful imagery, indeed! Well, we will grant all they ask, and we will see if we can make immersion, or even the *figure* of immersion. We will suppose the watery walls of the Red Sea stood perpendicularly fifteen hundred feet high, the children of Israel down between these walls, walking on the bottom of the sea, the cloud resting on the top of those walls, or above them—would this make out immersion? To be immersed, is to be completely surrounded, *above*, *below*, *and all around*. Now, what was there in their *front* and *rear?* Nothing. Well, this would not make out a case of immersion. But we are willing to go farther, and suppose they were covered above, and surrounded on their right and left, *front*, and *rear*. Would this be an *immersion* in the cloud and in the sea? They would only be *three-fourths* immersed; for, recollect, neither the cloud nor the sea was below them, for they *walked on dry ground!* And, to make out such an immersion as our opponents wish, Paul should have said, "They were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea, and in the *dry ground!*"

We will now show there is no foundation for the whole of this *ideal* immersion. Dr. Clarke says, (see his Com. on Ex. xiv,) "That part of the sea over which the children of Israel passed, was, according to Mr. Bruce, and other travelers, about four leagues (twelve miles) across, and, therefore, might easily be crossed in one night. It has been observed, that in the place where the Israelites are supposed to have passed, the water is about *fourteen fathoms*, or twenty-eight yards deep." The camp of Israel had the form of the *hollow square*—three tribes in front, three on the right, three on the left, and three in the rear, with the tabernacle in the centre, and surrounded by the Levites. After this manner they marched, as we are informed: "So they pitched by their standards, and so they set forward, (marched,) every one after their families, according to the house of their fathers," Num. ii, 34. (See the draft and notes on the above chapter by Dr. Clarke.)

Our opponents first presume the sea to be fifteen hundred feet deep. We see from the quotation from Dr. Clarke, it is only twenty-eight yards, or *eighty-four* feet. The second

presumption they make is, the sea divided—the water standing on the right and left as walls. They suppose the passage to be about the width of a common street. They marched agreeable to their encampment, *three* tribes forming each line of the *hollow square*, covering an area in circumference of *twelve* miles, so their front was at least three miles. It must have been a front of at least three miles, or else the camp could not cross in *one* night, for that was the time they occupied in crossing. For instance, when Xerxes was about to pass into Europe from Asia, across the Hellespont, now the Straits of Dardanelles, he had two bridges of boats erected, and it occupied his army of one million and eight hundred thousand men, "seven days and seven nights in passing over these straits; those who were appointed to conduct the march lashing the poor soldiers all the while with whips, in order to quicken their speed." (Rollin's An. Hist., vol. iii, p. 19.) Here the number is but a little over half as many as were in the camp of Israel. In order to cross over the sea, a distance of twelve or thirteen miles, they must have occupied a space at least *three* miles

wide; and then, with an altitude of water only *eighty-four* feet on the right and left, it will be with great difficulty that even an *ideal* immersion can be made out!

The whole mistake of our opponents here is supposing there was but *one* baptism, and that a conjoint baptism of the cloud and sea. There, doubtless, were two baptisms, the one with the cloud and the other with the sea. The apostle *first* states they were "under the cloud." This he afterwards explains by saying, "baptized with the cloud." (We say "*with*"—this is the general translation of this word in other places, and thus it reads in this place in the German Bible.) And, *secondly*, "and all passed through the sea;" and from the strong east wind that blew, they were *sprinkled* with the spray of the sea. This he calls "baptized with the sea." "Baptized in the cloud *and* in the sea," conveys the idea of two distinct baptisms, or times of baptizing. For instance, Washington fought with the British in New Jersey and in Virginia. This conveys the idea of more than *one* battle: well, baptized in the cloud and in the sea.

CHAPTER VII.

On Romans vi, *and Colossians* ii.

THE above are always brought forward by our Baptist brethren, especially when they are proselyting. They say, "You must be buried with Christ in baptism; and this you cannot do, if you only have a little water sprinkled on the face." Charmed and captivated by the mere sound of the passage, they lead off with this main position, that baptism is a "burial," "and if so, immersion must be the mode." This should be proved by them, instead of taking it for granted. We will show the whole theory of our opponents in the above is entirely fanciful. The whole passage reads as follows: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid: how shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, *(not water,)* were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, *(not water,)* that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in new-

ness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

We have already stated, in the argument on infant baptism, that this has reference to the baptism of the Holy Spirit; therefore, it does not refer to water baptism, *much less the mode.* To show this, reference will be had to the point under discussion by the apostle. And what is that? He was repelling a charge that was maliciously and slanderously brought against him by some of his enemies: namely, "And not rather (as we be slanderously reported, and as some affirm that we say) Let us do evil, that good may come? whose damnation is just," Romans iii, 8. They said Paul taught the doctrine, that "where sin abounded grace did much more abound," Romans v, 20. "So the more we sin, the richer we will be in grace." See in what a bold manner he attacks this charge! "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace

may abound? God forbid." He then goes on and reasons with the brethren of Rome, and shows it to be contrary to philosophy and religion. He asks the question, "How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" If dead to sin, they could not live any longer in the enjoyment of it; neither could they desire it. How could a man literally dead live in the world? "'*How shall we that are dead to sin:*' the phraseology of this verse is common among Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins. To DIE to *a thing, or person,* is *to have nothing to do with it or him—to be totally separated from them;* and to live to a thing, or person, is to be wholly given up to them—to have the most *intimate connection* with them. *Nihil mecum tibi,* MORTUUS TIBI SUM: *I have nothing to do with thee—I am dead to thee.*" (See Dr. Clarke's Commentary.) Those who were baptized into Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost, and received that marvelous change wrought in the heart by his energies, have died unto *sin* and the world, and have awaked unto newness of life. As Christ was literally dead, and arose from the dead, so must the sinner who is alive to the world and sin, *die*

o the world and sin: and as he is not only *bruised and maimed, halt and blind—the whole head sick and the heart faint*, but dead in trespasses and sins: and as Christ was raised from the dead by the power of God, so must the sinner be raised from *this* spiritual, or moral death by the power of the Holy Ghost, "*to walk in newness of life.*" This spiritual baptism, or change of heart makes the individual a new creature. Old things have passed away and behold all things become new. The natural tendency of this change of heart is, to cause him to walk *in newness of life.* John says, "Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not."

To show this in a clearer light, the apostle goes on and changes the figure, and says, "But if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be in the likeness of his resurrection." "Dr. Taylor observes that our translation does not completely express the apostle's meaning. Τα συμφυτα are such plants as grow the one *upon* and *in the other*, deriving sap and nourishment from it, as the *mistletoe* upon the *oak*, or the *scion* upon the *stock* in which it is grafted. He

would, therefore, translate the words: *For if we have been* growers together *with Christ* in the likeness of his death, (or in that which is like his death,) *we shall be also* growers together *with him in the likeness of his resurrection;* or in that which is like his *resurrection.* He reckons it is a beautiful metaphor, taken from *grafting*, or making the *scion grow together* with a new stock." (See Clarke's Com.) The apostle means precisely the same thing in the above expression, as he does when he says, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death." If being buried with him by baptism means immersion, what does it mean when he says, "Being planted together in the likeness of his death?" It must, also, mean immersion! And what resemblance is there between planting a young tree, or plant, the roots only being put under the ground, or grafting a scion on a stock, and plunging a man under the water!

Again: to make it still more certain that the apostle is not speaking of immersion, but a *change of heart*, he again changes the figure, and says, "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might

be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." The same meaning and doctrine are taught in those *three* figures: "Buried by baptism into death;" "planted together in the likeness of his death;" "and the old man is crucified with him." What resemblance is there between the Savior being nailed to the cross and crucified, and a person being immersed in water! This passage must be construed *literally*, or spiritually. If literally, then we must be literally baptized into Jesus Christ, (that is, immersed into him,) literally planted together with the Savior in the likeness of his death, and literally crucified with him; and this would be *literal* nonsense. This is the way our opponents would have the world to understand this subject—literally buried with him in water! Then we must understand it as having a spiritual allusion. The person having been baptized into Jesus Christ, or having experienced the new birth, and made a new creature, has experienced a *death* unto sin and the world, and a moral and spiritual resurrection, and walks in newness of life.

To show still further, that there is no reference to water baptism, the apostle tells us how

we are baptized into Jesus Christ: "For by one SPIRIT we are all baptized into one body," 1 Cor. xii, 13. This is, indeed, the fulfillment of John's prophecy: "I, indeed, baptize you with water, but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." John baptized the Church with water, but the Savior with the Holy Spirit.

In Col. ii, 11, 12, the apostle changes the figure again, and says, "In whom, also, ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting away the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." And this "circumcision made without hands," is explained to be "buried with him in baptism." This being the case, all must see it is not a physical, or literal baptism, but a spiritual one, because it is made "*without hands*." When the apostle says, "Buried with him in baptism, wherein, also, ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God," a regular antithesis is formed—one part opposed to the other. If the first part mean to be physically and literally buried in water, the second part means a literal and physical raising out of the water by the

muscular force of the administrator. But this does not agree with the apostle; for he says, "Ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God." If, then, the resurrection spoken of is "through the faith of the operation of God," it must be spiritual, and not literal; and, of course, the opposing part of the antithesis, namely, buried with him in baptism, must be spiritual.

Our opponents say, "The burial spoken of in Rom. vi, and the baptism are synonymous. 'Buried,' and 'baptized,' mean the same act: buried in baptism, and baptized in the burial." The interpretation of a word will always make good sense, if substituted for the original. They say, "Baptism means immersion, and immersion means a burial, and a burial means a baptism." Well, we will read it so: "Therefore, we are *immersed* with him by *immersion*." This would make the great apostle Paul, who was, in addition to his plenary inspiration, a logician of the highest order, speak nonsense.

We will now prove the "*baptism*" and "*burial*" spoken of here to be two different things; and, if so, the whole theory of our

opponents, as built on this passage, must go overboard, without the hope of a rescue; because, it is on the supposition *they* are the *one* and *same* act—mean precisely the same thing Whatever this "*burial*" may be, it is accomplished *by* baptism, as the instrument; therefore, it must differ from it. "Buried by baptism:" baptism stands here as the instrument that accomplishes the burial, and, as a matter of course, must differ from it. It stands in the relation of *cause*, and burial the *effect*. To say the cause and effect are precisely the same thing, is marvelous indeed!

We will make this plain by a few illustrations. We will suppose before us is a dead man by the name of A. We will call on a man by the name of B. to bury him. He goes and digs a grave, and takes the corpse and lays it in it, and pours the earth on him, until he is buried. A., the dead man, was buried by B., the live man. Do you not see a difference between B., the live man, and the burial of the dead man A., accomplished by him? Well, buried with him by baptism; therefore, baptism is the agent that accomplishes the burial, and, of course, differs from it.

Again: we will suppose we have some corn in our hand. We will say to our servant, "Take a hoe and bury it." He does so. The corn was buried by the hoe: the hoe was the instrument that accomplished the burial. We see there is a clear and manifest difference between the "*baptism*" and "*burial*." The one the cause, and the other the effect. Then the idea of immersion is clearly out of the question; for the whole theory of the immersionist is built on the supposition they were *one*.

The position that baptism is a burial, and a burial is a baptism, is without any foundation in Scripture. A few instances will show this. And Abraham said unto the sons of Heth, "I am a stranger and a sojourner with you: give me a possession of a burying-place with you, that I may bury my dead out of my sight," Gen. xxiii, 4. *That is, baptize them out of his sight!* "And after this, Abraham buried Sarah his wife in the cave of the field of Machpelah, before Mamre:" that is, baptized Sarah, his wife, in the cave of the field of Machpelah, before Mamre. And Jacob said unto his sons, "I am to be gathered unto my peo-

ple: bury me with my fathers in the cave that is in the field of Ephron the Hittite," Gen. xlix, 29: that is, they should baptize him in the cave that is in the field of Ephron, the Hittite! Again: "And another of his disciples said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father:" that is, baptize him! "But Jesus said unto him, Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead:" that is, let the dead baptize their dead!

Our opponents say, "The design of baptism is to represent the burial and resurrection of Jesus Christ." Admitting, for a moment, this to be the case, it could not be done by immersion. The tomb of Christ was the sepulchre of Joseph, which was cut out of a rock; the floor, or bottom of it was, perhaps, on a level with the ground. He was taken and laid in it. This would be like taking a corpse in a basement story of a house, and laying it down in the appointed place. A large stone was rolled to the door; and in the morning of the third day, an angel came and rolled it away, and Christ was awaked by the power of God, and he came forth from death's dark domain. How could immersion represent this most

glorious scene! If the Christian baptism is to represent the *burial* of Christ, then it is a commemorative ordinance, and should oft be repeated, like the sacrament of the Lord's supper, to refresh our memory. Again? The burial of Christ, for aught we know, may be of no more importance to us than his wearing a crown of thorns and the purple robe. But why no sacrament to represent that, and so on, and every incident in Christ's life have its own commemorative sacrament? Then could we outnumber the Catholics in sacraments. Besides, we have the sacrament of the Lord's supper to represent the shedding of Christ's blood and the breaking of his body—in a word, his death and resurrection, with all that he has done for us, while we have no sacrament, unless it is baptism, to represent what the Holy Ghost does for *us* in applying the merit of Christ's blood, and changing and purifying our hearts. Have we two sacraments to represent what Christ has done for us, and none to represent the agency of the Holy Ghost in our salvation? We think not.

We will now show this position to be untenable and unscriptural.

The design of water baptism is to represent the "sprinkling of the blood of Christ," or the baptism of the Holy Ghost, as we have already stated. Christ has instituted the eucharist, or Lord's supper, as a memento of his sufferings, and an *institution* to represent his *death*, *burial*, *resurrection*, ascension, intercession, and his second coming to judge the world. This is all embraced in the Lord's supper Paul says, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," 1 Cor. xi, 26.

To make it still plainer that baptism is not to represent the fact that Christ was laid in Joseph's sepulchre, and his resurrection from the dead, we will present to you the faith and practice of the apostles before the crucifixion of the Savior. It is a fact they baptized thousands before that time. Being with the Savior daily for three years and a half, it must be presumed, or admitted, they were thoroughly instructed in reference to the design of baptism; and if they had been instructed it was to represent the Savior's burial and resurrection, they would have, as a matter of course, embraced the doctrine of his resurrection; but

this was not the case. The same day that Christ arose from the dead, two of the disciples went to Emmaus, a village not far from Jerusalem, and the Savior fell in company with them; but they did not know him, but conversed with him on the subject of his death and resurrection, and said, "Yea, and certain women, also, of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre * * * said he was alive." This being a fact, they had not the most distant idea that the design of baptism was to represent the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ, "For as yet they knew not the Scripture, that he must arise again from the dead," John xx, 9. After the Savior had appeared to all the disciples but Thomas, and they reported the fact to him, the idea was so astounding and extraordinary, that he "said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my fingers into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe," John xx, 25. Can it be supposed that Thomas, with the rest of the disciples, had been administering baptism to thousands for three years and a half, and teaching them that the de-

sign of baptism was to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, that would take place, when he, and they, had not as "yet known the Scripture, that he must arise from the dead!" This is to suppose an impossibility. To be an immersionist, you must believe all this: that the apostles baptized to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, and taught the same, when they themselves did not know he must arise from the dead!

Permit me here to introduce a query. Is it necessary to have correct views of the use and design of baptism to make it valid, though the mode may be correct? Or, will a perverted use, or design of baptism render it nugatory? Suppose we were to invite the Church members to come and partake of the Lord's supper, and we should state the object of the sacrament to be a representation of the crucifixion of Peter, and we should rehearse the circumstances of his death, and portray his sufferings in a vivid manner, so that the minds of the communicants are fixed upon Peter's death while they receive and partake of the bread and wine, yet in all other respects they conform to the mode, and all the directions in the word of God

concerning this institution: I ask if they have validly received the sacrament? The great apostle would answer, "They have eaten and drunk to themselves condemnation, because they did *not discern the Lord's body.*" If, then, having an improper object in view invalidates an ordinance, those whose object in baptism was to represent the burial of Christ, are, indeed, as unbaptized (though they may have been immersed in Lake Erie) as if not a drop of water touched them. It is our opinion a perverted use and design of baptism will render it nugatory. For instance: we will suppose a sect will arise and teach that a person must be baptized to represent the transfiguration of Christ on the mount, and would practice accordingly. Query: would their baptism be the Christian baptism? Or, suppose another sect would start up and teach that the design of baptism is to represent Christ's forty days and nights temptation in the wilderness, or his triumphant entry into Jerusalem: though the mode and ceremony be correct, would it be Christian baptism? It is evident it would not; for it would be a perversion of the use and design of Christian baptism. And

for aught we know, baptism, in fact, could represent Christ's forty days and nights temptation of the devil in the wilderness, as well as the *three* days in the sepulchre.

Well, then, if the teaching and practice of the immersion Churches are wrong, when they say baptism is to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, which is evidently a perverted view of the use and design of baptism, is not their baptism invalid and nugatory? This is the view that Paul takes of circumcision: "For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made *uncircumcision*," Rom. ii, 25. This being the case, are there not more *unbaptized* persons in the immersion Churches than all others, notwithstanding their boasting, that they practice that mode of baptism admitted by all to be correct?

But, admitting for a moment the design of baptism is to represent the *burial* and *resurrection* of Christ, *pouring*, according to the Scriptures, would do it; but not immersion. "Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper, there came unto him a woman having an alabaster-box of very pre-

cious ointment, and *poured* it on his head as he sat at meat. But when his disciples saw it, they had indignation, saying, To what purpose is this waste? For this ointment might have been sold for much, and given to the poor. When Jesus understood it, he said unto them, Why trouble ye the woman? for she hath wrought a good work upon me. For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. For in that she hath *poured* this ointment on my body, she did it for my burial." Matt. xxvi, 6–12. Here we see, the woman *poured* a little ointment on the Savior's *head;* and he said she hath *poured* it on his body, *and she did it for his burial.* Nowhere in the Scripture is the idea held out that *plunging*, or *immersion*, is to represent a burial.

There are two leading, or fundamental principles in theology, whereby we expect to obtain eternal salvation: 1. The shed blood of Christ, for the remission of our sins. 2. The application of that blood to our hearts by the Holy Ghost, whereby we obtain a pardon of, and a cleansing from sin. There are two sacraments divinely appointed in the Church to represent them: 1. The eucharist: "As often as ye eat

this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." 2. Baptism: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body;" "Our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

But our opponents say, "But ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto you," Rom. vi, 17. And taking for granted "that form of doctrine" was a burial in water, they come, triumphantly, to the conclusion, that immersion is the mode of baptism. Doctrine, or the "form of doctrine," has been, by the Scripture, compared to the falling of dew and rain. Moses says, "My doctrine shall drop as the *rain*, my speech shall *distil* as the *dew*, as the *small rain* upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass," Deut. xxxii, 2. If, then, the "*form of doctrine*" is to settle the mode of baptism, it is *certain sprinkling* is the Bible mode.

But, once more: "We are buried with him in baptism." This burial has continued from the time it took place with the apostle, and the brethren at Rome, until the time of writing his epistle to them. If this mean a literal burial in

water, as our immersionist friends say, then Paul must have been a good while under water! He was converted and baptized, A. D. 33; he wrote this epistle to the Romans, A. D. 58; which would make twenty-five years he was under the water. This being the case, he must have been preaching to the people, and writing his epistles to the different Churches, though literally buried under water all that time! The apostle says, "We are buried." That burial continued from the time it took place until the time of writing this epistle, which shows clearly it could not have been a literal burial in water. For as the death is spiritual, the resurrection to "newness of life," of course, is spiritual. Well, we have, 1st, a death; 2d, a burial; 3d, a resurrection. The death is spiritual; the resurrection is spiritual; then, as a matter of course, the burial must be spiritual.

CHAPTER VIII.

The baptism on the day of Pentecost—The baptism of Cornelius—The baptism of Paul—The baptism of the jailer.

THE *baptism on the day of Pentecost.* The disciples were all assembled with one

accord, in one place—probably in an upper room, in Jerusalem. The Holy Ghost was poured out upon them the third hour of the day, which answers to our 9 o'clock in the morning. They all preached, especially Peter: "With many other words did he testify and exhort." We may reasonably suppose they occupied three or four hours in their public addresses. It would, also, take some time for them to have the congregation prepared for baptism—such as, their assent to certain doctrines and facts, proposed to them as the rule of their faith and practice; though this might be done *en masse*, by raising of hands. This, however, would take some time; and, as the Jewish day ended at 6 o'clock, P. M., they would only have from three to five hours to baptize *three* thousand. How could this be done by immersion? and, especially, when not more than one administered the rite at the same time and place? But suppose the twelve were engaged in baptizing on this occasion, and we will allow there were five hours of time, then each must have baptized *fifty* for each hour—almost one for every minute! If they were *four* hours baptizing, then each one

must have baptized sixty-two every hour—more than one for every minute! But if they were only *three* hours at it, then each one must have baptized eighty-three every hour—about one for every three-quarters of a minute! We are informed, it requires a man in good health, and of strong muscular powers, to immerse forty or fifty at one time, and it would require a man of Herculean abilities to immerse eighty or one hundred without being completely prostrated. Then, is it probable the apostles immersed three thousand: that is, two hundred and fifty each, at one time? which, probably, could not be without a miracle. The Lord does not usually carry on the ordinary operations of his Church by his miracle-working power. The probability is against the idea of immersion in the case; for where could they be accommodated with water? They say, "The pool of Siloam—the pool of Bethesda, with its five porches—the brook of Kedron, and the brazen seas of the Temple."

1. *The pool of Siloam.* This was a spring which came up under the wall near the gate of the sheep-market. Dr. Clarke says, its waters were collected into a large reservoir, to supply

the city for drinking and culinary purposes. Admitting there was a sufficient quantity for immersion, can it be supposed the inhabitants of Jerusalem would have permitted them to immerse in it?

2. *The pool of Bethesda.* It is stated that an angel came down once a year and troubled the waters, and the first diseased man that stepped in was healed. It is supposed the blood from the sacrifices offered at the Temple was conveyed to this pool, and from this it received its healing qualities. Let this be as it may, it was connected with the services of the Temple—with the *brazen seas*, which were all under the control of the priests and Pharisees, who were inveterate enemies of Christ and his apostles, and, doubtless, would not have consented to such a use.

3. *The brook of Kedron.* This is a small stream which passes along half a mile east of the city, which is dry nearly nine months of the year. There may be a considerable current in the rainy seasons. However, it is the sewer of the city, and is called Kedar, or Kedron, (*black.*) It cannot be supposed they immersed in it.

They, doubtless, were baptized by *pouring*, or *sprinkling*. 1. From the fact that the apostles and people were baptized by the Holy Ghost, which was by pouring. The reasonable inference is, that the apostles baptized the people in the same way that God had just baptized them. 2. As Jerusalem was not furnished with rivers, or creeks, and as there is no intimation that they removed from the place where the word was preached, therefore, the most reasonable conclusion is, they were baptized by *sprinkling*, or *pouring*. And as this is the first time Christian baptism was administered, if immersion were to be the only mode, is it not very probable something would be said of going to the water, and of a change of raiment, so necessary when immersion is practiced? Look at the accounts of revivals by the immersionists. They generally say something which shows, definitely, that they practice immersion: such as, "Going from the place of worship to *such a stream of water;*" "*the weather was very fair;*" "*the weather was stormy;*" "*the roads muddy;*" "we cut through the ice, for the weather was very cold;" "the crowds that assembled on the

banks," &c. These expressions show that they practice immersion. In all the Scriptures there is not a single expression that goes to show any of the circumstances to which we have alluded. You will bear in mind that Philip and the eunuch were traveling, and came to water.

The baptism of Cornelius. He was a devout Gentile. The Lord, in answer to prayer, directed him to send to Joppa for Peter, at the same time instructed Peter to go and open the kingdom of heaven to him and the Gentile world. And when he had preached the word unto them, the Holy Ghost fell upon them, as it did upon the Jews at the beginning, or day of Pentecost. And when they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God, then answered Peter, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord," Acts x. They were assembled in the house of Cornelius; and when the Holy Ghost fell on them, or they were baptized with it, Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized." The

plain understanding of the above is this, can any man forbid water from *being brought* that these should not be baptized?

To make it clear that this is the true meaning of the above, we will examine the word translated "*forbid.*" It comes from the verb κωλυω, to *check, hinder, stop, stay, delay;* to *impede, obstruct;* to *prohibit, forbid.* (See Grove's Greek Lexicon.) In the baptism about to be performed, the people and water must come together. The people must either go to the water, which they would do, if they were to be immersed, or the water must be brought to them, which would be done, if they were to be *sprinkled;* and the prohibition would necessarily be of the *moving party.* If they were about to be immersed, the people would have to go to the water. Then, the apostle, doubtless, would have said, "Can any man *check, hinder, stop, stay, delay, impede, obstruct,* prohibit, or forbid *the people from going to the* water, that they should not be baptized?" But this was said of the water, "Can any man *check, hinder, stop, stay, delay, impede, obstruct, prohibit,* or *forbid* water *from being brought,* that these should not be baptized?"

Therefore, it is plain water was to be brought to the people, and they were not to go to the water. The irresistible conclusion, if prejudice is left aside, is, the above case of baptism was performed in the house, and water was brought for that purpose; therefore, they were *aspersed.*

The baptism of Paul. Paul was on his way to Damascus, when a light shone around him above the brightness of the sun, which prostrated him to the ground. Being blind, he was led into the city. So deep and pungent were his convictions, that he could not eat, drink, or sleep. In this debilitated and exhausted condition Ananias found him. He laid his hands on him, and said, "Brother Saul, the Lord (even Jesus that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest) hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized. And when he had received meat, he was strengthened," Acts ix.

The natural inference, from the history of the case, would be, that Ananias baptized him

in the house of Judas, where he found him; and immediately meat was set before him This view of the subject is strengthened by an examination of the Greek text of "*arose*," αναστας; this is the second aorist participle of ανιστημι, which means to *stand*, *rise*, *rise up again*. The literal rendering of the above passage would be, "and (Paul) *having stood* up, was baptized," or, *standing up*, *was baptized*. For instance, "And in those days Peter stood up (αναστας) in the midst of the disciples," Acts i, 15. Again: "And there *stood up* (αναστας) one of them, named Agabus," Acts xi, 28. Again: "Then Paul stood up, (αναστας,) and beckoning with his hand, said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience," Acts xiii, 16. The active participle made use of here, points out the manner of the baptism and position of the body, which was *standing up*. This would not only be a *house* baptism, but the candidate was in a *standing* position when he received baptism. Paul was found in a weakened and prostrated condition. Ananias laid his hands upon him, and he received his sight. He then said unto him, "And now why tarriest thou? arise,

(αναστας, stand up,) and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." He then arose, or stood up, either on his knees or feet, and in that position was baptized.

Permit me here to digress for a moment. Mr. Campbell and his followers put great stress in support of their theory on the above passage. They wish to inculcate the idea, that the *washing away of sin* is done in the act of baptizing; but, in a few words, we will show you this is not the case. "*Why tarriest thou?*" is one idea; "*arise*" another; "*and be baptized*" is another; "*and wash away thy sins*" is another. And how? By "*calling on the name of the Lord.*" Peter says, on the day of Pentecost, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved," (that is, shall have their sins washed away,) Acts ii, 21. This active participle clearly defines the manner. For instance, cleanse a house—*sweeping* it, or *washing* it; cleanse a garment—*brushing* it, or *washing* it. Ananias said unto him, "Why *defer*, or *procrastinate?* arise, or *stand up*, and be baptized;" and then he was to wash away his sins, and thus defines

the manner: by "*calling* upon the name of the Lord."

The baptism of the jailer. Paul and Silas had been in a very providential manner directed to Philippi, and when there were followed daily by a damsel possessed of an evil spirit, who brought her masters much gain by soothsaying. She said, "These men are the servants of the most high God, which show unto us the way of salvation." This was a grief to them; for they knew the Philippians would suppose *they* were, also, in league with the devil, if they were introduced and recommended by this pythoness. Paul commanded the evil spirit to come out of her; and when her masters saw the source of their gain was gone, they caught Paul and Silas, and brought them before the magistrates, who commanded them to be beaten; and when they had laid many stripes upon them, they cast them into prison, charging the jailer to keep them safely, who, having received such a strict charge, thrust them into the *inner* prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks. And at midnight Paul and Silas prayed, and sang praises to God. And suddenly there was a great earth-

quake, and the foundations of the prison were shaken, and the doors were opened. The jailer called for a light and sprang in, and brought them out of the *inner prison*, or dungeon, into the outer prison. Being satisfied it was of the power of God, he cried out, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" And they said, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. The jailer took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his own house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house," Acts xvi.

This appears to be another case of *house baptism*. Doubtless, the place where the word was preached was the place where their stripes were washed, and where they were baptized. This was in the *outer* prison. The jailer first put them here; but afterwards, having received strict orders, thrust them into the *inner prison;* and, after the earthquake, he called for a light, and sprang in, and tremblingly fell down before Paul and Silas, and brought them out

from the *inner* into the *outer* prison. This was the place of preaching, washing of stripes, and of baptizing. Doubtless, the apostle took a little of the water which was left from washing of their stripes, or, it may be, some was brought especially for the purpose of baptizing, and *sprinkled* the jailer and all his little ones. And then the jailer brought them into his own house, or that department where his family resided, which was under the same roof with the prison, and set meat before them, and rejoiced with his family. But our opponents even try to make a case of immersion out of this! They say, "The jailer brought them out of the prison, and went away to a river about a mile distant, and there the apostle immersed him and all his." Those who contend for the above position, say, the jailer brought them out of the prison for the purpose of going to the river to be baptized; and when they came back, he brought them into his own house, which was separated from the prison, and then set meat before them. But this shows what even good men will do, through prejudice, and a determination to support a favorite theory. The jailer (a heathen) did

not know any thing about Christian baptism, much less desired it, before Paul explained it to him in preaching the word. After preaching they were baptized. But the first thing that was done after the jailer sprang in with a light, *was to bring them out from the inner* prison to the outer. This could not have been for the purpose of going away to be baptized; for at this time he knew nothing about it, for it was before the preaching of the word. But our opponents wish to make the impression that the jailer brought them out for that purpose, but this is a great mistake. 1. The jailer called for a light, and sprang in. 2. He brought them out of the *inner* prison, where they were thrusted, into the outer. 3. Then and there the word was preached unto all that were in his house, and the jailer and all his were baptized. 4. Then he brought them into his own house, and set meat before them, and rejoiced with his family. Dr. Clarke says, "And, by the way, if he and all his were baptized straightway, παραχρημα, immediately, instantly, at that very time, *dum ipsa res agitur*, it is by no means likely that there was any *immersion* in the case. Indeed, all the

circumstances of the case—the dead of the night, the general agitation, the necessity of dispatch, and the words of the text, all disprove it. It is, therefore, pretty evident, that we have in this chapter very presumptive proofs, that baptism was administered without *immersion*, as in the case of the jailer and his family." (See Dr. Clarke's notes on Acts xvi, 33.)

The jailer was a sworn officer; and if he had permitted Paul and Silas to go out without authority, he would have violated his oath; and instead of standing before them as an acceptable candidate for baptism, he would have stood before them a *perjured* man! Not only that, but, if found out, it would have *cost* him his life! Such was the rigor of the Roman law, that a jailer was held responsible for the prisoners put in his custody. If they escaped, whether accessory thereto or not, he was generally punished with death. For instance: the Lord miraculously delivered Peter from prison in Jerusalem; "and when Herod had sought for him and found him not, he examined the keepers, [of the prison,] and commanded that they should be put to death." The jailer knowing this to be the case, when

he awoke and saw the prison doors open, supposing, as a matter of course, the prisoners had escaped, he was about to fall upon his own sword; as it was a virtue among the heathen to fall by one's own hand, when death was inevitable. But his bed-chamber was so close to the doors of the prison, that by the light that enabled him to see that the prison doors were opened, Paul saw what he was about to do, and he cried out, "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here."

Being night, our opponents suppose "the jailer and his family might have gone out to the river, and back again, without much fear of detection." *This could not be.* We are informed that there was a *great earthquake*—that the *foundations* of the prison were shaken! And what are the natural consequences of a great earthquake? Houses falling down, people rushing from them into the streets or open air, as their only refuge! The hour the jailer was baptized, was not an hour of quietness and repose to the inhabitants of Philippi, but a time of great alarm and agitation. Can it be supposed, under all these circumstances, that the jailer would have gone, or could go with the

prisoners and his family to the river, and back again, without detection? And where, or what was the motive, (without which man will not act,) to go out at midnight's hour, at so great a hazard as that of his life? And for aught we see in the nature or obligation of baptism, he might have deferred it until next morning, or next week. And to make this still more certain, the next morning the magistrates sent word, privately, to let Paul and Silas go. "But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly, uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out;" showing, clearly, they had not been out the night before, or else Paul dissembled.

Our opponents, being pressed with this view of the subject, say, "Philippi is situated in a tropical climate, and it is customary, in countries scorched with the suns of the torrid zone, to furnish their prisons with baths, for the health and comfort of their prisoners, and in one of those baths Paul immersed the jailer and his family." This, indeed, develops the hopelessness of their cause. Philippi is situ-

ated not far from the northern extremity of the Ægean Sea; about *forty-one degrees north latitude*, which would throw it as far north as northern Ohio. Surely the perpetual "*scorching suns of the torrid zone*" are not experienced on Lake Erie's bleak shores! Thus we see the subterfuge of our Baptist brethren, to make immersion in any wise agree with Bible teaching or apostolic practice.

CHAPTER IX.

Immersion impracticable under many circumstances—Congregation going to the water—A change of clothing—Immersion compared to a bank bill.

We now urge another objection to immersion as being the mode of baptism. *It* cannot be practiced at *all times, under all circumstances, and in all countries.* The Savior would, doubtless, appoint that mode of baptism which could be administered under all conditions and circumstances of human existence. But immersion cannot be administered at all times, and under all circumstances; therefore, it strongly argues, the Savior never appointed immersion to be practiced universally, as the mode of baptism.

To show you that it cannot be practiced at *all times*, *women*, from one-fourth to one-eighth of their time, embracing a period of nearly thirty years of their lives, though *enjoying good health*, cannot be immersed in cold water without *imminent danger* to their health and life. Then, if immersion is the mode of baptism, women cannot obey a plain commandment for nearly *one-fourth* of the time of the above period, though by faith and repentance they are proper subjects.

Immersion cannot be practiced under *all circumstances*. Men and women have, and doubtless will, too frequently put off the concerns of religion, and the momentous interests of their deathless spirits, to the last period of their existence; and when lying on a dying bed, they see and realize their past folly, and wake up to a due concern for themselves and repent of their sins, (and, doubtless, in many cases, find pardon to their souls,) many will desire baptism and the Lord's supper. Well, on the Baptist theory, they could not be baptized without instantly destroying life in some cases! Here, then, the poor *penitent*, *forgiven*, and *dying* sinner, must be denied the

comforts of those holy sacraments when they most need them. In this situation, thousands have had their souls comforted and strengthened; which cannot take place under the administration of the Baptist Churches. Let a minister of the regular Baptist Church sit down at the bedside of a *forgiven* and dying sinner, and he will say, "O brother, or sister, you can get to heaven without baptism or the Lord's supper—you feel the pardon of your sins—*that is enough!*" But, let him sit down by a person in health—say, a rich merchant, or farmer, and he will say to him, "O how important it is that you should be baptized! You should follow your Savior's footsteps down the banks of Jordan, and be buried with Christ by baptism, that you may arise from the Savior's watery grave to newness of life. To get to the good world, you must immediately go forward in baptism, and there is no baptism without immersion." Well, how is this difference of ministry to be reconciled? Why, in the first place, their system could not be carried out without *destroying* life; therefore, they propose, or prefer to let them die without baptism; and, in the second place, a

PROSELYTE is to be made: therefore, the whole theory and practice of *immersion* must be brought into requisition, and put in operation.

Our Campbellite friends act more consistently, in cases of sickness, when it is impracticable to immerse in cold water. They dig out, or nail up troughs, and *warm* the water, and then immerse the candidate. Yet they say they take the Scripture just as it reads for their practice. And, indeed, we have known a number of instances where both the administrators and candidates have been violently attacked with disease by practicing baptism by immersion. Names could be given, if required.

Once on the Sabbath, I was preaching at a quarterly meeting on baptism, and said, "Mr. ——, the Baptist minister of this place, by his first essay in the water, being young, and not accustomed to it, and not having received his '*gum-elastics*' on from the east, was violently attacked with disease." He, being present, arose and said, "I was sick before I went into the water." We said his attending physician told us, it was caused by going into the water; and he advised him to keep out of the water. A Baptist clergyman

from ——, being present, said, "The advice was correct; for it would make the administrator sick, but not the candidate." If the Lord has ordered immersion to be the mode of baptism, is it not a great pity he did not order that the health of the administrator should be preserved as well as that of the candidate!

There are now thousands of *aged* and *infirm* ministers, though very useful, who, if revivals should break out in their charges, could not administer baptism by immersion without jeopardizing their useful lives; and, of course, it must be delayed until some *robust, healthy, young* administrator can be procured. But the modern practice will, in a great measure, obviate this difficulty. Administrators, I have been informed, generally use gum-elastic drawers, or "*baptistories*"—a garment worn under their clothes, which *keeps out* the water. This shows that they consider they cannot go at all times in the water to administer baptism without jeopardizing their health; or, that they must consider the practice of baptizing by immersion in cold water a *hard and disagreeable work.* The Savior says, "My yoke is easy and my burden is light."

How can immersion be practiced in all countries? In some countries there are extensive sandy deserts and plains, where there is no running water for hundreds of miles; men and women live there, who procure their water by digging, sometimes to a great depth, or by traveling to an immense distance for it. We will now suppose a revival to break out there—how could they be immersed without great labor and inconvenience? Artificial means must be resorted to; troughs, or baptistories must be made, and water must be procured for that purpose, when, at the same time, it is with the greatest difficulty a sufficiency for drinking and cooking can be obtained.

In other countries, toward the poles, for the greater part of the year, water is nearly as solid as the mountain rock itself. From the rigor of the climate, people generally live in caves, or dens, in the rocks. How can baptism by immersion be practiced there? Meeting-houses must be erected there, the Gospel preached, and the sacraments of the house of the Lord duly administered, before the millennium will take place.

Even in our own country, though we live

in a temperate zone, for some three or four months in the year our streams are frozen up. If immersion is the mode of baptism, then those streams must be cut open, and the candidate, whether robust or *delicate*, must submit to the harsh and dangerous enterprise of going down into the water until it shall be of sufficient depth, and then be plunged under its surface; and from their *trembling*, *sobbing*, *sighing*, and *catching* of their breath, we should think, in the general, it would produce any other state of feeling than that of solemn devotion. Many times, the stream, or baptismal scene, is some distance from any house where the candidates could go and change their clothes; and by the time they arrive at the place where this could be done, not unfre quently their clothes have been frozen stiff upon them. Can it be supposed, when the Savior said, "My yoke is easy, and my burden is light," he ordained and appointed all this? We believe, wherever the Gospel is preached, *there* the ordinances of the house of the Lord *can* be administered, whether on the plains of India, or the deserts of Africa, or amidst snow-capt mountains and ice-bound

streams, or at midnight's solemn hour in some cruel prison, or *on the bed of death.*

If immersion were practiced by the apostles, doubtless, there would be something said about the congregation removing from the place of preaching to the stream, or water; but in all the history of the doings and acts of the apostles, there is not a word said about going from the place of preaching *to* water for the purpose of baptism. Take up the periodicals of the Baptist Churches, and in their descriptions of their revival operations you will see it frequently stated, "The congregation repaired to such a stream, though the day was inclement—it *rained, snowed,* or the road was *muddy,*" &c. Then, there were so many "baptized, immersed, or were buried in immersion, and arose from the Savior's watery grave," &c. Thus leaving no doubt on the mind that they baptized by immersion. Can it be conceived that our Baptist friends can set forth facts in a clearer light than the apostles—men writing under the guidance of the Holy Spirit? Then, if the apostles practiced immersion, it would be expected they would at least be equally clear in setting forth those circumstances and

facts so necessary to immersion—such as, the congregation going from the place where they were prepared for baptism, by the preaching of the word, to the water, and the changing of clothing, &c. On all these points the Scripture is entirely silent; and is it not a reasonable expectation that something should be said in reference to clothing? for, if they were immersed, except a change were provided, their wet clothes must remain on them. This would be a matter of great inconvenience, if it would not, in some cases, produce disease and death. It is reasonable to suppose the apostles would recommend a change, if it could be procured conveniently, or, at least, something would be said on the subject—either there was no danger in remaining in their wet clothes, or they had better procure a change. The apostles have been particular in reference to clothing in other cases: for instance, when the Savior was about to wash the disciples' feet, "He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments; and took a towel, and girded himself," John xiii, 4. Again: the witnesses that stoned Stephen "laid down their clothes at a young man's feet, whose name was Saul,"

Acts vii, 58. It must be supposed, if the apostles immersed, something would be said about going to the water, and a change of raiment.

Our opponents say, "We practice the mode of baptism admitted by all to be valid baptism; and would it not be the best for all to be immersed, as all agree it is valid baptism, and as many believe *pouring* and *sprinkling* not to be baptism?" They then go on and compare immersion to a *bank bill*, and say, "Would you not rather take a bank bill, though it may look a little *soiled* and *worn*, which all the people say is good, than to take *one* that looks prettier, of which some have doubts as to its genuineness?"

In reference to the fact that all agree that immersion is valid baptism, we say we believe the apostolic and Scriptural mode of baptism to be by *affusion*. But to satisfy the conscience of a person who desires the whole body to be wet, we suppose the superabundance of water will not destroy the validity of the rite—the Lord taking the will for the deed. In this way we agree that immersion may be, or is baptism. But if the position taken by our oppo-

nents be true, which is, that "no baptism is legal which is not performed in the way and manner that the apostles baptized," then we contend that immersion is not legal baptism, and the whole Baptist Churches are without valid baptism, even from their commencement until the present time, and none of their members are baptized, except the few that were *sprinkled* before they united with them; and even in their case, it is doubtful whether they now can be called *baptized persons*, as they have *repudiated* the apostolic form of baptism, and have embraced man's improvement on baptism, as we humbly conceive. And as to the "*bank bill*," the people are willing to receive it as genuine, though it may have the marks of being a good while in circulation. But, suppose we take that same old popular *bill* to the bank, and let the cashier condemn it, and put his mark of infamy upon it, who would wish to take it? Well, take the old popular bill, "*immersion*," to the "*bank*"—the BIBLE—there it will be instantly condemned. That word which is so precious to many, namely, *immersion*, is not found among the precious coin of this bank; neither has it

any coin that can be converted into it, when speaking of the mode of Christian baptism.

CHAPTER X.

The three that bear record in heaven and in the earth, 1 JOHN v, 7, 8—*Westminster Assembly.*

"FOR there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one."

1. THE WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT. "Behold, I will *pour out* my Spirit unto you," Prov. i, 23; "I will *pour* on the house of David the Spirit of grace," Zech. xii, 10; "He shall come down like *rain* upon the mown grass: as showers that water the earth," Ps. lxxii, 6; "I will *pour* my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring," Isa. xliv, 3; "Then it shall come to pass I will *pour out* my Spirit upon all flesh," Joel ii; "His going forth is prepared as the morning; and he shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth," Hos. vi, 3.

The New Testament agrees with the above: "And being assembled together with them, commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. * * * But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you," Acts i, 4–8. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit was *poured* out upon them. Peter says, "Hath shed forth this ye now hear and see." At the house of Cornelius, "The Holy Ghost fell upon all them that heard." Peter, in rehearsing the matter, says, "The Holy Ghost fell on them as *on us* at the beginning."

2. THE WITNESS OF THE WATER. "I will pour water on him that is thirsty;" "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations," Isa. lii, 15; "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you and ye shall be clean. * * * I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes," Ezek. xxxvi, 25, 27; "Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word," Eph. v, 25, 26;

"But according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost," Titus iii, 5; "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water," Heb. x, 22; "My doctrine shall drop as the rain, my speech shall distill as the dew, as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass," Deut. xxxii, 2; "Sprinkle the water of purification upon him," Num. xix. The Levites were all consecrated by *sprinkling*. (See Num. viii.) John says, "I indeed baptize you *with* water."

3. The witness of the blood. *The blood of the passover.*—"And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the basin, and strike the lintel and the two side-posts with the blood that is in the basin," Ex. xii, 22; "Through faith he [Moses] kept the passover, and the *sprinkling* of blood," Heb. xi, 28; Moses "sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover, he *sprinkled* likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry," Heb. ix, 19–21. *Blood of atone-*

ment.—"And he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and *sprinkle* it with his finger upon the mercy-seat eastward: and before the mercy-seat shall he sprinkle of the blood with his finger seven times," Lev. xvi, 14. *Blood of Christ.*—"And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of *sprinkling*," Heb. xii, 24; "Elect * * * through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and *sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus Christ," 1 Pet. i, 2.

These three, the Spirit, water, and the blood, agree in one *fact:* namely, *purification;* and one *mode*, which is *sprinkling*, or *pouring*.

Our opponents say, "Baptism by *sprinkling* is of recent date: it was only introduced by the Westminster Assembly, by the casting vote of Dr. Lightfoot; and if it had not been thus introduced, all would be now practicing immersion." The remarks of Dr. Miller are to the point. (See his work on Baptism.) "It has been sometimes ignorantly, and most erroneously asserted, that the Westminster Assembly of divines, in putting to vote whether baptism should be performed by *sprinkling* or *immersion*, carried it in favor of sprinkling by a majority of *one only*. This is wholly incor

rect. The facts were these. When the committee who had been charged with preparing a 'Directory for the worship of God' brought in their report, they had spoken of the mode of baptism thus: '*It is lawful and sufficient to sprinkle* a child.' To this, Dr Lightfoot, among others, objected; not because he doubted of the entire sufficiency of sprinkling; for he decidedly preferred sprinkling to immersion; but because he thought there was an impropriety in pronouncing that mode lawful only, when no one present had any doubts of its being so, and when almost all preferred it. Others seemed to think, that by saying nothing about *dipping*, that mode was meant to be *excluded* as *not a lawful* mode. This they did not wish to pronounce. When, therefore, the clause, as originally reported, was put to vote, there was twenty-five voted in favor of it, and twenty-four against it.

"After this vote, a motion was made and carried that it be *recommitted*.

"The next day, when the committee reported, and when some of the members still seemed unwilling to exclude all mention of *dipping*, Dr. Lightfoot remarked, that to say that

pouring, or *sprinkling* was *lawful*, would be 'all one as saying that it was *lawful* to use *bread and wine* in the Lord's supper;' he, therefore, moved that the clause in the 'Directory' respecting the mode of baptism be expressed thus: 'Then the minister is to demand the name of the child, which, being told him, he is to say, (calling the child by his name,) "*I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*" As he pronounceth these words, he is to baptize the child with water, which, for the manner of doing it, is not only *lawful*, but *sufficient*, and most *expedient* to be, by *pouring* or *sprinkling* of the water on the face of the child, without adding any other ceremony.' This was carried. (See Lightfoot's Life, prefixed to the first volume of his Works, folio edition, p. 4, compared with Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii, pp. 106, 107, compared with the Appendix, No. II, quarto edition, where the 'Directory,' as finally passed, is given at full length.)

"We do not learn precisely, either from Lightfoot's biographer, (who was no other than the indefatigable Strype,) or from Neal, by what

vote the clause, as moved by Lightfoot, was finally adopted, but Neal expressly tells us that 'the Directory passed the Assembly with *great* unanimity.'

"From this statement, it is evident that the question which was carried in the Assembly by a majority of *one*, was not whether affusion or sprinkling was a *lawful* mode of baptism, but whether all mention of *dipping*, as *one* of the *lawful* modes, should be omitted. *This*, in an early stage of the discussion, was carried by a majority of one in the affirmative. But it would seem that the clause, as finally adopted, which certainly was far more decisive in favor of sprinkling, or affusion, was passed 'with *great* unanimity.' At any rate, nothing can be more evident than that the clause. as it originally stood, being carried by one vote only, and afterwards, when recommitted, and so altered as to be much stronger in favor of sprinkling, and then adopted without difficulty, the common statement of this matter by our Baptist brethren is an evident misrepresentation."

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

265.17
S525

Shaffer, Hiram M.
AUTHOR

A treatise on baptism.
TITLE

265.17
S525 Shaffer, Hiram M.
A treatise on baptism.

18549